

CATHOLIC EDUCATION
A STUDY OF CONDITIONS
BY J. A. BURNS

936.73

B937

Columbia University
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



CATHOLIC EDUCATION

Permissu Superiorum.

A. MORRISSEY, C.S.C.,
Provincial.

Nihil Obstat.

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN,
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur.

✠ JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York

NEW YORK, *October 1st, 1917.*

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

A STUDY OF CONDITIONS

BY

REV. J. A. BURNS, C.S.C., PH.D.

AUTHOR OF "ORIGIN AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM";
"GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM"

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH ST., NEW YORK

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

ROMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1917

Copyright, 1917
BY
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

936.73
B937

1170
A.P. "C"
m.c.m.

PREFACE

It has been my purpose in this work to describe the condition of Catholic education in the United States at the present time, and to direct attention to the problems that must be solved in order to insure its future progress. After a survey of the general condition of Catholic education, its fundamental principles are examined from the standpoint of religion and morality, as well as of modern psychology. The relations—ideal and actual—of the several departments of Catholic educational activity to each other are next discussed. A special study is then made of each of these departments, including grade schools, high schools for boys, high schools for girls, colleges and seminaries.

The book is intended primarily for Catholics, but I have also had in mind non-Catholics who are desirous of being fully informed about Catholic education—its aims and methods, its problems and difficulties, its achievements and future prospects. Such readers will, I think, be specially interested in noting the connection that exists between certain Catholic educational movements

and general educational movements or tendencies of the time. I am hopeful that the work, besides contributing directly to the progress of Catholic education, will thus help, in some measure, to bring non-Catholic Americans to a better understanding and appreciation of the contribution that Catholics are making, at such heavy cost and sacrifice, to the advancement of the highest interests of our common country.

My thanks are due to a number of kind friends, for the practical assistance they rendered me in preparing the work for the press.

JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C.

HOLY CROSS COLLEGE,
Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.....	V

CHAPTER I

GENERAL CONDITIONS

A Quantitative View. Qualitative Aspect. Stability of Catholic School System.....	I
--	---

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL TEACHING

In the Public Schools. Religious Knowledge is the Most Important. Religious Instruction and Moral Instruction Must go Hand in Hand.....	15
---	----

CHAPTER III

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIDE

Some Current Teachings. The Correlation of Studies. The Atmosphere of the School.....	30
--	----

CHAPTER IV

INNER RELATIONS

Organization. Cooperation. Causes of Lack of Coop- eration. What Has Been Accomplished. Lines of Future Progress.....	48
---	----

CHAPTER V

TEACHING THE CHILDREN

PAGE

The Diocesan System. The Teaching. The Curriculum. Keeping Children at School.....	66
--	----

CHAPTER VI

HIGH SCHOOLS FOR BOYS

Number and Kind of Schools. Teachers. Relation to Catholic Colleges. Relation to Parish Schools. Cost. Proper Work of the Catholic High School. Reorganization of the High School.....	88
--	----

CHAPTER VII

THE SECONDARY EDUCATION OF GIRLS

Schools and Pupils. Free High Schools for Girls. Quality of the Instruction. Woman's Changed Position. Future Progress.....	111
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII

COLLEGE GROWTH AND TENDENCIES

Increasing Enrollment. Colleges for Women. University Development. Preparatory Departments and Junior Colleges. The Curriculum—Standardization. Endowment and Support. Freedom of Teaching.....	126
---	-----

CHAPTER IX

INNER COLLEGE PROBLEMS

Discipline. Religion. The Teacher.....	149
--	-----

CHAPTER X

SEMINARIES

Diocesan and Religious Seminaries. Preparatory Seminaries. Government and Discipline. Length of the Curriculum. New Studies. Seminary and College. Equipment and Support.....	169
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	193
INDEX.....	195

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

GENERAL CONDITIONS

A QUANTITATIVE VIEW

CATHOLIC schools are found in every State, and, generally speaking, in number proportionate to the Catholic population. In many of the States they antedated the public schools and those of other denominations. Catholic education extends to the entire Catholic cosmopolitan population. There are schools for Germans, French, Italians, Poles, Spanish, Bohemians, Lithuanians, Slovaks, Greeks, Hungarians, and Belgians, besides schools for the Indians and colored people. The effort to care educationally for these foreign nationalities has proceeded along a definite and comprehensive plan. Many religious teaching communities have been formed for this work, the latest being a Slovak Sisterhood founded in 1910, at Scranton, Pa.

Catholic education likewise undertakes to provide completely for the development of the

child, from the beginning of formal school work to the completion of post-graduate studies. It embraces kindergarten and elementary school, high school, college and university. Furthermore, two distinct types of institutions for both secondary and higher education are maintained, for co-education does not exist in Catholic colleges or universities, and in secondary education it is found only in the smaller schools.

There were 1,456,206 pupils in the 5488 Catholic elementary schools in the United States in the year 1915. Elementary pupils in Catholic high schools and academies would make an addition of about 90,000 to this number. Pupils in orphan asylums are not included.¹ About 36,000 teachers were engaged in the elementary schools, nine-tenths of these being religious, belonging to 275 teaching communities. Male teachers numbered probably less than one-fifteenth of the total.²

In the same year, Catholic educational institutions contained 74,538 pupils of secondary school grade. This total was made up, approximately, of 17,000 boys in colleges, 29,000 pupils in high schools attended by boys alone or by both boys and girls, and 28,000 pupils in girls' high schools or

¹ *Cath. Dir.*, 1915.

² Burns, *Growth and Development of Cath. School System*, pp. 216, 381.

academies.¹ Altogether, the boys numbered 34,798 and the girls 39,740. There were 84 male colleges with secondary-school pupils, 599 high schools containing boys, and 577 academies for girls—making a total of nearly 1300 institutions carrying on instruction of secondary grade.

In the 84 male colleges engaged in collegiate work, there were found enrolled, in the year 1916, 14,846 students of collegiate grade.² In the colleges for girls, there were at least 1000 collegiate students.³

An interesting question is as to the proportion of Catholic pupils who are attending institutions that are non-Catholic. In the case of the elementary schools, investigation has shown that the enrollment in Catholic schools is not quite one-half of what it ought to be, or, in other words, that about the same number of Catholic children go to the public schools as go to Catholic schools.⁴ It must be remembered, however, that the diocesan

¹ Burns, *Cath. Secondary Ed. in the U. S.* (*Bull. of the Cath. Ed. Assn.*, Aug., 1915).

² *Report on the Attendance at Cath. Colleges and Universities in the U. S.* (*Bull. of the Cath. Ed. Assn.*, Aug., 1916); cf. chapter VIII, *infra*.

³ The *Report of the Bureau of Ed.* for 1914 gives six institutions, with a collegiate enrollment of 685. These returns are far from complete.

⁴ Burns, *Growth and Development*, p. 356.

school system, in some of the great centers of population, is unable to accommodate at once the vast numbers of Italian and other immigrant children arriving every year, and that even the state school system is unable to do this. Furthermore, probably one-fourth or even one-third of the entire number of Catholic children of school age live in towns, villages, or country districts in which the Catholic population is so small or scattered that parish schools are impracticable.¹ There are other causes that lead Catholic children to attend the public schools,² but these two conditions offer the greatest obstacles to the systematic extension of the diocesan school system. Until immigration ceases, or at least slackens, and until Catholics greatly increase in number in the country districts and smaller towns, it is not likely that there will be much change in the above proportion. Catholic elementary-school enrollment is growing at a very rapid pace, but it is not growing faster than the general population.

The proportionate enrollment in Catholic secondary schools, in 1915, was somewhat less than one-third of the secondary-school enrollment generally in the United States. While Catholic sec-

¹ *Ib.*, p. 357.

² *Ib.*, p. 358 *seq.*

ondary education has shown a remarkable growth of late, this growth has not kept pace with that of the public high schools. The increase of attendance at the latter has been far more rapid than the increase of the population of the country.

Catholic male colleges and universities have almost one-half of their due proportion of collegiate students, if we take as a standard the general collegiate enrollment in the country. The growth of collegiate enrollment in Catholic institutions of higher education has been more rapid than the growth of the Catholic population, and more rapid, too, than the general increase of collegiate enrollment throughout the United States.¹

The data upon which these statements are based may now be summed up in such a form as to render comparison the more easy and accurate. The following table shows the proportion of the

*For each 10,000 of respective population.**

	Elementary Students.†	Secondary Students.†	Students in Higher Education.‡
In Catholic institutions...	893	46	9
In entire United States§.	1948	153	19

* For the year 1915.

† Including male and female pupils.

‡ Including only male students (cf. note 2 on p. 127).

§ From Report of Commissioner of Education.

¹ Cf. Chapter VIII, *infra*.

Catholic population that is enrolled in each of the above classes of Catholic institutions, as compared with the proportion of the general population of the country that is enrolled in all schools or institutions of the corresponding class.

QUALITATIVE ASPECT

It is safe to conclude, from what has been said, that Catholic educational institutions, elementary, secondary, and higher, are fairly holding their own numerically in the general educational development of the country. But what of the quality of the schools and the teaching? It is not so easy to institute a comparison here, for a number of distinct factors have to be taken into account. Religion is one of these, since, in the eyes of Catholics, the teaching of religion invests the school with a value that nothing else can give it. This factor will be considered in the two following chapters. After religion, the most important of the qualitative factors that affect the school are equipment, curriculum, and teaching. It will be more convenient to confine our attention, throughout the remainder of this Chapter, to the elementary and secondary schools, and to reserve consideration of the colleges till farther on.¹

¹ Cf. Chapters VIII and IX.

It may frankly be admitted that, with certain exceptions, the equipment in Catholic schools was not, in the past, equal to the equipment in the corresponding state-supported schools. But a great change has taken place. Not only in the large cities, but even in the smaller cities and towns, Catholic schools of all kinds are now to be seen which compare favorably with the public schools, in respect of building, interior appointments, and class-room equipment. Everywhere to-day there is a keen realization of the need of making school buildings and equipment thoroughly up-to-date and equal to the best.

Since the public schools occupy a position of prestige and advantage, owing to their relation to the state and their numerical preponderance, it might be expected that the curriculum of the parish school would tend to conform to that of the public school. As a matter of fact, the tendency in the parish schools has always been towards the adoption of the same academic standards as have obtained in the public schools, including curriculum, text-books, methods of teaching and educational theories, the only exception being in the matter of religious instruction.¹ The so-called "real" stud-

¹ Cf. Burns, *Principles, Origin and Estab. of Cath. School System*, p. 161; also *Growth and Devel. of Cath. School System*, p. 350.

ies, in spite of all the clamor raised against them, have steadily made their way into the curriculum of the parish school, as they have into the curriculum of the public school. The movement has been, perhaps, a little slower in the one case than in the other, for Catholics are prone to be conservative in such things, especially on account of the increased expenditure involved. Again, attempts that have been made of late to bring about radical changes in the curriculum of the parish schools have failed so far, because of a general feeling that such action would be inexpedient, except in conjunction with a similar reform in the public schools.¹

It is by the teaching, however, that the quality of a school is chiefly to be judged, and in this respect Catholic schools, both elementary and secondary, have a certain fundamental advantage. It is admitted on all sides that the great obstacle to efficient teaching in the public schools is the shortness of the service of the most capable teachers. A recent writer in the *Educational Review* puts the matter in this way:

It is the most serious disadvantage of women as teachers, that the more desirable they are, the more they contemplate a marriage which will take them out of teaching. Hence,

¹ Cf. *Rep. of Cath. Ed. Assn.*, IX, p. 87; also, Chapter VI *infra*.

they cannot give themselves to teaching with the whole-heartedness, the professional spirit, of the man who sees no other avenue to success. But when marriage is no longer probable the woman loses something of what she already has.¹

Whatever may be thought of the last statement, there can be no question that marriage is constantly depleting the ranks of the trained teachers. No remedy, apparently, can be devised for this condition of things, except the replacement of women by men, and this is at present an economic impossibility. The effect of this condition upon the quality and standard of the teaching in the public schools is dispassionately shown by a member of the editorial staff of the Bureau of Education, in his "Survey of Education During 1911-12." In discussing current criticisms of the schools, he says:

The usual criticism is rather of the inadequacy of the supply of teachers than of the inefficiency of the individuals, though, of course, there is a direct relation between the two. The teaching standard is unquestionably lower in many parts of the United States than in certain other countries, for a number of reasons that need not be entered into here. It is seldom recognized how inadequate the supply of teachers for American schools really is. There were, last year, about 25,000 graduates of teacher-training courses in colleges, normal schools and high schools in the United States.

¹ *Ed. Rev.*, XLIII, p. 33.

It is found by the Bureau of Education that the average length of employment is less than five years. With a total teaching force of about 450,000, this means that not more than one in five of the teachers actually employed is professionally trained, even on a minimum basis. In one Western State, by no means the lowest in educational facilities, only about one-half the teachers in the schools have even a high-school education, and there are many parts of the United States where the average education of the teachers is not above the seventh grade.¹

In contrast to this condition, the Rt. Rev. Philip R. McDevitt, when Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, drew attention to the advantages enjoyed by the Catholic teaching body, made up, as it is, almost entirely of Brothers and Sisters:

The teachers of the parish schools make teaching a life work; with them it is a high calling, a distinct vocation which is entered upon with no thought of turning therefrom until age or infirmity removes them from the field of activity. . . . While inexperienced teachers are found in the parish schools, it is inevitable that their number should not be as large in a system where teaching is a life work as in a system where it is not. Still more, the evils resulting from inexperienced teachers are more easily corrected in the parish-school system, because of the spirit of solidarity and cooperation which characterizes religious communities, and which brings to the young teacher the helpful assistance of the principal and of older teachers.

¹ *Rep. Bur. of Ed. for 1912, I, p. 11.*

By reason of this attitude which the teachers of the parish schools assume toward their work, and by reason of other puissant forces inherent in our system of education, it is certain that, at no distant date, the results of parish school education will bear more than a favorable comparison with those of the state-supported institutions.¹

Catholic teachers have to pass through the postulate and novitiate, and are, therefore, never without considerable professional preparation when they begin their work. It is a *life-work* with them, moreover, and whatever may be the defects of the young teacher, the "spirit of solidarity and cooperation" in religious communities may be counted on as a permanently helpful influence in the teacher's life and work.

It may be pointed out that during the past decade great progress has been made by the teaching communities in respect to normal school training. Postulate and novitiate courses have been enlarged and strengthened; summer institutes have been reorganized; and—most important of all—summer schools, lasting from four to six weeks, have been instituted at several of the larger Catholic colleges, where Sisters may have the benefit of regular college courses conducted by able and experienced professors. The summer school at the Catholic University, Washington, was attended, in 1916, by

¹ *Report for 1913*, p. 20.

304 Sisters, representing 25 religious orders, 64 religious houses, 40 dioceses, and 27 States, besides the Dominion of Canada.¹ A fact of even greater significance in this connection was the conferring of the degree of Bachelor of Arts the same year on sixteen Sisters, the degree of Master of Arts on ten, and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on one, all of these being students of Sisters' College, a higher normal institute at the Catholic University.²

STABILITY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

The upkeep of the parish schools is costing Catholics in the United States about \$12,000,000 a year, besides the cost of permanent improvements. This is truly an enormous sum to raise each year by voluntary contributions. The amount is, of course, steadily increasing, and it is likely to be near \$20,000,000 by the next census-year. Can the school system be maintained under this heavy financial burden?

There are two factors in the Catholic school system which may be briefly referred to, in answer to this question. The first is, *the teachers*. We have seen that they nearly all belong to stable religious organizations, and that they make teaching their

¹ *Cath. Ed. Rev.*, XII, p. 157.

² *Ib.*, p. 177.

life work. If there were a question of abolishing the public schools and substituting something else in place of them, the half million teachers in the public schools would stand arrayed in solid opposition against the change, and their influence would be apt to be decisive. May we not likewise say that the forty thousand teachers engaged in Catholic elementary and secondary schools constitute a most effective guarantee of the stable continuance of the Catholic school system? With them it is more than a matter of individual interest; the very life of the teaching *community* is bound up with the continuance of the schools.

The second factor is *the people*, the source from which is drawn annually the vast sum of money required for the support of the schools. Can the people be relied on to continue this support? Individuals have been known to complain of the burden. Yet, in spite of the constant increase of the sum-total that is needed, the Catholic people as a whole have continued, year after year, to contribute the requisite funds, not only uncomplainingly, but with cheerful confidence. They have, indeed, felt the burden and the injustice of a double school support, but they have believed, at the same time, that Catholic schools are more than worth their heavy cost. To-day, as never before, Catholics are united in support of the principle of

religious education, with all that it involves. They have a firm conviction that they must ever stand for this principle, whatever be the ways and means by which its realization may be legitimately sought in practice.¹

The struggle for Catholic schools is, in fact, largely a thing of the past. The main issue has long since been decided. Beginning far back in the days of the very infancy of Catholic life in this country, the Catholic school system was continually enlarged with the growth of the Church, until it attained its mature proportions in the period of wonderful Catholic development that followed the first great immigration. It was the immigrants, especially those from Germany and Ireland, who really settled the matter.² Catholics of the present generation have had only to preserve and perfect the educational system which they found already solidly established.

¹ For the financial cost of the parish schools, cf. Rt. Rev. Mgr. Philip R. McDevitt, Supt. of Schools of the Archdiocese of Phila., in his *Ann. Rep. for 1913*, p. 17; also the calculation made by the author, with approximately the same result, for New York City, in *Amer. Eccl. Rev.*, XLIV, p. 531 *seq.*, art. on *The Economic Side of the School Question*, and the author's *Growth and Devel. of the Cath. School System*, p. 274, *seq.*

² Burns, *Growth and Develop. of Cath. School System*, p. 15.

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL TEACHING

IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It was shown by Bishop Hughes, some four-score years ago, that although the public schools of his day might provide well enough for the religious instruction of Protestants, they could not be made satisfactory to Catholics for the same purpose. The public schools of that time were strongly Protestant in tone; the teachers were generally Protestants, and Protestant Bible-reading and prayers formed part of the daily program. But even if the Douay Bible were to be substituted for the King James Version, the Bishop would have remained unsatisfied. He maintained that the Catholic creed had, in the nature of things, to be taught *in its entirety*, in order to be taught effectively. It was not so with the Protestant creeds, these being "so ambiguously defined that the addition or subtraction of half a dozen dogmas cannot destroy their identity."¹ The fundamental position of Bishop Hughes, in all his utterances on

¹ Hassard, *Life of Archb. Hughes*, p. 177.

the school question, was simple and clear: It was essential that the Catholic religion should be taught to Catholic children in the school; and since this was impossible in the public schools as constituted at the time, it was imperative for Catholics to establish schools of their own.¹ He was governed by the same principles in his attitude towards colleges. This is still, substantially, the attitude of Catholics towards the public schools and the non-Catholic colleges.

The public schools, however, have changed considerably in character since the days of Bishop Hughes. They have lost their Protestant tone, especially in the large centers of population. In many schools the Bible is still read, and a daily prayer offered; but the prayers are, as a rule, as colorless as the daily prayer in the houses of Congress, and the prevailing tendency for a long time has been towards the complete elimination of Bible-reading. The State of Illinois, by a decision of its Supreme Court in 1910, was added to the list of States that bar from the classroom not only the Bible, but also prayers and hymns of any kind.²

Positive Christian teaching has thus been practically eliminated from the public schools. Moral teaching, however, can never be entirely eliminated

¹ *Ibid.*; Cf. *Works of Bishop Hughes*, Vol. I, *passim*.

² Decision of June 29, 1910.

from them, because certain moral habits and virtues are absolutely essential, not only to civilization, but even to normal school-room life. The school could not do its work at all, except there went along with the pupil's growth in knowledge a certain growth in moral power—the formation of habits of honesty, industry, fidelity, thoroughness, order, patience, and the rest. These habits may be acquired, to a certain degree, through the teaching of the common-school branches, and, indeed, they must be at least partly so acquired. This holds true for Catholic schools, no less than for those in which religion is not formally taught. But while moral habits and virtues must necessarily be inculcated by the public schools, even though there be no formal instruction in ethics, yet, without positive Christian or religious teaching, such habits and virtues must rest upon a purely naturalistic basis, consisting of the ideas of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, which are found in rational nature and are made known by the voice of conscience.

Now, the American people, as a whole, are far from desiring that the moral training of their children shall be based solely upon a pagan ethics. The atmosphere of America is Christian. Most Protestants or descendants of Protestants, however indifferent they may be in the matter of church-

going, cling to Christian standards and sanctions of moral life, and are certainly not willing to accept anything inferior to these for their children. The great majority of the American people would agree with Archbishop Ireland that, "Morals not imbedded in the conscience are but shadowy conventionalities, powerless in presence of strong temptation; and the conscience, to be the moral censor it is destined by the Creator to be, must be permeated with, solidified in, religion: The conscience without God and the Savior is as a tribunal without a judge."¹ How, then, is the acquiescence of most American parents in the complete exclusion of religion from the public schools to be explained?

There are several facts that throw light upon this inconsistency. First of all, the abandonment of positive Christian teaching in the schools has been a *gradual* process, and not a sudden change. The framers of the public school system never intended or even considered as possible, the complete de-Christianization of the schools. The plan they adopted comprehended the teaching of such fundamental Christian truths as would be acceptable to all. The multiplication of religious denominations, together with the influx of non-Christian

¹ Pastoral Letter, Aug. 18, 1913, *A Catholic School for Catholic Children*.

immigrants and the growth of unbelief, completely upset this plan, and religious teaching in the schools has had to give way, little by little, under the influence of these entirely unforeseen conditions. It has been a case of the unwise adoption of a principle the consequences of which were not forecast.

Again, although moral instruction in the public schools has been reduced to a purely naturalistic basis, Christian standards of moral conduct still obtain in the schools, as they do in the life of the people. For instance, the child is taught to practice honesty. The motives that are proposed to him, to this end, are probably no higher than the motives that were proposed to children by their preceptors in pagan Greece and Rome. But the standards of honesty and virtue to-day are higher. The ideals and standards of morality which were introduced into the world by Christianity have been implanted too deeply in the life and aspirations of the race to be easily laid aside, even when they are no longer associated with the great truths from which they spring; and as long as the Christian religion prevails in the land, its ideals and standards of moral conduct must have a certain influence in the schools.

The chief factor, however, in this attitude of the Protestant parent, is reliance upon the Sunday

school. With the gradual elimination of religion from the school, there grew up the belief that the work that religion did in the school could be done just as well in the Sunday-morning class, under the auspices of the church. Indeed, it has even been maintained that the work of religion would be done all the better, by reason of its being confined to the Sunday-morning class.¹ What had become a matter of practical necessity, thus came to be defended and advocated on psychological grounds.

One very serious disadvantage of the Sunday school is, that attendance at it cannot, in the nature of things, be made compulsory. Many parents are neglectful; and the tendency in America is to allow children greater liberty. It is a generally admitted fact, at any rate, that not over 50 per cent of the children of the United States attend Sunday school.² Here is, at the very outset, an insurmountable obstacle to the effective substitution of the work of the Sunday school for religious instruction in the ordinary school.

But is the Sunday school an efficient and satisfactory substitute, in the case of the children who do attend it? There can be no doubt that, under

¹ Cf. Paper of W. T. Harris, in *Proceedings of National Ed. Assn.*, 1903.

² *Ed. Rev.*, XXXV, p. 132; *America*, Oct. 24, 1914, p. 52.

existing circumstances, the religious instruction imparted in the Sunday school is very important for the Protestant denominational bodies. It would be impossible for them to get along without it. Nevertheless, there is grave reason for doubting the efficiency of the Sunday school, even with respect to those who regularly attend it. At the World's Sunday-school Convention in Washington, in 1910, a distinguished delegate made the statement that 75 per cent of all the boys over thirteen years of age in the Protestant Sunday schools of the United States are lost to the church, and never make profession of faith. The calculation was made, it was stated, after study, observation, and experience, and appears to have been agreed to by most of the delegates present.¹ This statement is cited here simply because it is typical of past and present criticism of the Sunday school.

If we now turn from the data of fact and experience to a consideration of the principles involved, it will be still clearer that the Sunday school is altogether inadequate to provide the necessary religious and moral instruction for the child. It will be seen that the position of Catholics—that religion must be taught *in the schools*—is but an inevitable practical conclusion drawn from fundamental tenets of the Christian Faith, as well as a

¹ Quoted in *Cath. Standard and Times*, Aug. 6, 1910.

practical expression of established psychological laws. The discussion of psychological principles will be reserved for the following chapter. Here we will consider the question of religious instruction in the school with reference to the acquirement of necessary religious knowledge and the development of sound moral character.

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE IS THE MOST IMPORTANT for the pupil, because, above all, we are creatures of God, and are, therefore, bound to worship and obey Him as our Creator. Our duties to God stand before all our other duties; and the knowledge and worship of God must ever be first among the obligations arising in the dawning intelligence of the child. But it is impossible for the child to acquire a due knowledge of God and of his obligations towards Him in a few lessons, or within a few weeks or months. Time is needed, as with all other branches of knowledge. Progress can be made only step by step. Hence, the work of teaching religion should occupy the place of first importance in the education of the child and should be, so far as possible, continuous. These conditions can be realized, in the case of the majority of children, only in the regular daily school.

Consider, again, the Christian teaching about the future life. A course in engineering that would

make no account of the future work of the engineer would be fatally defective. Not less defective, surely, must be a system of education that leaves out of account the life after death, if one accepts the view that the present life is for each individual but a preparation for an unending life that is to follow, and that the happiness or unhappiness of each in the future life is to be determined by his success or failure in the moral and religious order here on earth. Hence, Catholics consistently hold that the complete moral and religious instruction of the child and youth is abundantly essential for his welfare, both here and hereafter, and should occupy a place of corresponding importance in his daily acquisitions of needful knowledge.

I have mentioned only two of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The consideration of others, such as the Incarnation or the law of charity, would lead just as plainly to the same conclusion. To the Christian mind, all these are incontrovertible truths. Since this is so, it is essential that the Christian child should come to know them and to regulate his life by them, at the earliest possible age and in the most complete manner. The home, the school, and the Church must each furnish its share of his religious instruction and training. The work of all three is

needed. And even after these three universal agencies of education have done their work and done it well, the young Christian man or woman will still have much to learn in the sphere of religious truth and practice—so earthly is our nature, so profound and far-reaching are the “deep things of God.”

A second reason upon which Catholics base the necessity of religious instruction *in the school* is, that

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION AND MORAL INSTRUCTION
MUST GO HAND IN HAND,

if either is to be effective. All admit that there must be moral instruction in the school; but the moral virtues that go to constitute the Christian ideal of conduct are not really separable from their religious background. “Morality,” says Bishop Shahan, “is religion in daily life, religion applied to our ordinary actions, the love and fear of God brought to bear upon the passions of men.”¹ From the very beginning of Old Testament history, the two things, religion and morality, are represented as intimately united. The life and teachings of Christ bring into even clearer light the indissoluble character of their

¹ *God and Morality in Education*, in *Cath. Ed. Review*, VI, p. 393.

union. To attempt to separate the two, therefore, and to teach morality without religion, is to attempt to undo the work of divine revelation. "What God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

As a matter of fact, the most compelling motives and sanctions in the moral order are inextricably bound up with the great primary truths of the Christian faith. These supreme moral sanctions are, the attainment or loss of one's last end, in final union with or separation from God. Even here and now, these conditions are inchoately realizable, inasmuch as man's life in the moral order may either lead him to God, or withdraw and separate him from God. Hence the idea of sin, as an offence against and a separation from God. It is plain that the motive of sin, as well as that of reward or punishment in a future life, can have no moral efficacy, apart from belief in God and His divine attributes.

An apt illustration of the necessity of appeal to these supreme sanctions is afforded by the current agitation for the teaching of sex-hygiene in the schools. What is to be done to save the rising generations from the flood of vice that is threatening to engulf them? Forewarn them of the danger; explain to them the secrets of physiology and biology; point out clearly the path of nature, and paint in the strongest colors the penalties

nature exacts for disobedience to her laws—such is the demand we hear. Catholics are opposed to the teaching of these things in the schools, for both religious and psychological reasons. They do not deny that in individual instances it may be expedient to urge certain of the above considerations. But they have the confessional for this, and in the confessional, as elsewhere, the natural motives and sanctions for right moral conduct are never separated by them from those higher motives and sanctions afforded by faith. They hold that, in the light of history and experience, purely natural and human motives are incapable of producing such firmly rooted habits of virtue as shall be proof against either the stormy passions of youth or the subtler temptations of maturer years. They seek to impress on the youthful mind that,

That is right which is according to the will of God, and that is wrong which is opposed to the same high and holy rule of conduct. Man does not make his own morality, nor can society make it for him. It is not a conventional thing, nor a passing condition of manners, or an elegant fairness and sweetness of life, but a stern and solemn and fixed rule of conduct made known to us by Almighty God. From this rule none may deviate. None may ignore it, and by it all must one day be judged. The moral law, thus taught, ceases to be a weak rational restraint, no stronger than the uncertain heart and the darkened mind of

man; it is God Himself shining through our nature, dimly, but sweetly and warmly.¹

Are these supreme moral sanctions above the grasp of the child in the school? They are in reality less difficult for the child to grasp than the natural motives for right conduct that may be proposed to him. Seek to explain, for instance, why one should not steal. The idea of justice, the sense of honor, the bond of universal brotherhood—do these motives appeal as forcibly to the immature mind of the average child as does the simple idea of God and His will? Ask a Catholic child, Would you steal? The child will tell you that he would not steal, because God does not wish us to steal; that God made us, and we must obey Him; that if we obey we shall be rewarded, and if we do not obey we shall be punished.² The Catholic child has thus a simple, clear, rational, ethical system, and this system is based upon unchangeable religious truth; it is the idea of duty, but illumined and transformed by the rays of divine faith.

Religion, however, does not impair in any way the force of the purely natural motives that may be appealed to for right conduct; on the con-

¹ Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, *op. cit.*, p. 394.

² Rev. F. W. Howard, *The Catholic Position in Education*, an address delivered before the Protestant Ministers of Columbus, O., Feb. 7, 1910.

trary, it greatly adds to their force. There is not, in fact, a single natural motive for the doing of what is right and good, which is not enlarged and enriched by the religious maxims laid down by Christ and exemplified in His life and in the lives of the Saints. In the case of honesty—to continue the same illustration—the motives of natural justice are reinforced by motives in the supernatural order, such as, “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.” The sense of honor, as a motive for honesty, cannot but be heightened by the realization of the nobleness and dignity of man’s nature as depicted in the pages of the evangelists. The bond of universal brotherhood, as a motive for social actions, was unknown to the pagans, and can have no real validity apart from the religious truths from which it springs. If we are all children of one Heavenly Father, the duty of brotherly love is a consequence that any child can grasp; if we are not, the wisest philosophers can furnish no valid reason for an all-inclusive charity.

But if religion and morality are not really separable in practice, must it not follow that our ideals and standards of moral conduct will deteriorate, if separated from the religion of Christ? The new and higher moral code which He promulgated was based upon the fundamental Christian truths. Can

this higher Christian moral code be maintained, with the teaching of only natural ethics in the schools? It may, perhaps, be maintained for a time. (As has been pointed out, even though religion is not taught in the public schools, Christian standards of morality still have influence there. Nevertheless, since only natural motives and sanctions for right conduct are appealed to in the schools, there must result a gradual lowering of the moral standards of both pupils and schools to this same level; and this must mean, in time, a corresponding deterioration in the morals of the people.) It is a well-recognized principle of pedagogy, that mere intellectual content does not count for much, unless it is brought into use or action.¹ So, likewise, Christian ideals and standards of moral life will gradually lose their motive power, unless they are constantly reinforced through feeling and action.

¹ Shields, *Philosophy of Education*, p. 309.

CHAPTER III

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIDE

SOME CURRENT TEACHINGS

TEACHERS of philosophy and psychology in non-Catholic colleges and normal schools generally accept the theory of evolution, and employ it as a "working hypothesis" in the study and exposition of the phenomena of consciousness. Some distinguished Catholic scholars are believers in a modified evolution, but they maintain, at the same time, "the absence of all proof that man's body is derived from animal ancestors, and the proof that man's spirituality is not from animality as its source."¹ The theory of evolution, as it is commonly taught, is but little related to established facts, and appears to run counter to both Scripture and Christian tradition. If there were no other objection to the public schools and the non-Catholic colleges, the fact that so many of their teachers profess materialistic or agnostic views about the origin and nature of the human

¹ Views of Rev. E. Wasmann, S. J., in *London Tablet*, Aug. 30, 1913, p. 327.

soul would constitute a serious difficulty for Catholics who might be disposed to send their children to such institutions.

Much the same might be said about the teaching of sex-hygiene in the schools. Catholics, as has been said, are opposed to this, on both religious and psychological grounds. Eminent psychologists have taken the same stand. At best, the teaching of sex-hygiene is but an experiment, and, in matters of religion and morality, Catholics are inclined to be conservative. Where the eternal destiny of a soul may be involved, there can be no room for experimentation.

Nor can Catholics regard without suspicion a pedagogical scheme or system based upon the theory that "the normal child, placed in natural surroundings, is always good"; and that, "if one finds that a child in such surroundings persists in being bad, it is patent that it is abnormal, being either physically or mentally weak."¹ Whatever may be thought of this theory, as applied in the Montessori kindergartens, there are very serious objections to its application in the elementary schools.

The tendency towards paternalism in the public schools, which has become increasingly evident

¹ Maria Montessori, *Washington Post*, Dec. 5, 1913; cf. *America*, X, p. 130.

during recent years, need not concern us here, although it has led to a fear that the nation's schools might be made an adjunct of the socialistic propaganda.¹ This question lies beyond the scope of our present discussion, which has to do with the psychological basis of the Catholic system of education, especially as regards the teaching of religion *in the school*.

There are many facts and laws in the domain of psychology that bear upon the question of teaching religion in the school. The most important of these are summed up in two broad and universally recognized pedagogical formulas which we may conveniently make use of. One of them is,

THE CORRELATION OF STUDIES

Correlation means, "such arrangement of the different lines of work in the school that the work in each constantly bears upon the work that is being done at the same time in the other subjects."² This is correlation in the stricter sense. The term has also a broader meaning. It may refer to the bringing about of the proper connection between school work and the outer life. Some of

¹ Cf. Bird S. Coler, *Socialism in the Schools*, and *The Residuary Sect*.

² Henderson, art. on *Apperception*, in *Cyclopedia of Education*, I, p. 143.

the most promising educational movements of the day have to do with correlation in this wider aspect—"the correlation of school and home, of school and vocation, and of school and the entire present or future outside activity of the pupil."¹

Correlation in the stricter sense, as defined above, may be of two kinds—incidental, and systematic.

Incidental correlation is that which arises as a result of the broad presentation of a topic to a class. If the teacher is giving a history lesson on the discovery of America by Columbus, and makes use of arithmetic, geometry, geography, natural history, literature, and drawing, as a means of developing interest in the class and giving a comprehensive notion of the event, she is employing correlation. Systematic correlation involves such arrangement of the content of the various subjects in the curriculum as makes them constantly bear upon each other.¹

A systematic correlation of all the subjects in the curriculum, however desirable, is full of difficulties. Various schemes of study have been proposed for this purpose, but so far none of them has met with more than a limited acceptance. Incidental correlation, however, is now generally recognized as a necessity for good teaching.¹ The principle may be applied, more or less, in almost every recitation. The interlocking of one subject or branch of the curriculum with the

¹ *Ib.*, II, art. on *Correlation*, p. 210.

others, in so far as the particular topic that is being treated may allow, is one of the most distinctive features of modern pedagogical method.¹ "No piece of knowledge," says Maxwell, "should be left isolated, unassociated with other pieces of knowledge."²

What is the reason for the universal acceptance of the principle of correlation, and the ever-widening scope of its application? The reply is, that correlation enables the child to understand better what he studies; it makes his studies more interesting, and the use of the knowledge gained more easy and sure.³ A deeper reason lies in the psychological laws of association. James declared that "there is no other *elementary* causal law of association than the law of neural habit," and he formulated the law in these terms: "When two elementary brain processes have been active together or in immediate succession, one of them, on re-occurring, tends to propagate its excitement into the other."⁴ In other words, an idea or image tends to recall that other idea or image which has been habitually associated with it. The other idea

¹ Cf. Shields, *The Teaching of Religion*, C. II, on Correlation.

² *Ed. Rev.*, XLVII, p. 172.

³ Henderson, *op. cit.*, II, p. 209.

⁴ *Psychology, Briefer Course*, p. 256.

or image may not, as a matter of fact, always be recalled, for there are other factors than mere frequency or habit that play a part. But the most radical tendency, whether it be in the case of simple or of compound images, is that of recall through frequency or habit of association.

The Catholic view, as regards the teaching of religion in the school, is in perfect harmony with the laws of mental association, as formulated by psychologists, and given pedagogical application by Herbart in his theory of apperception. To illustrate, by a few examples. In nature-study, if the idea of God as the Creator of nature and her laws is kept before the mind of the child, there will be a tendency on the part of the child to recall the idea of God in connection with the phenomena of nature. If, in the study of history, Christ is properly represented as the central figure in all history, and Christianity, as the most important and comprehensive fact in history, the youth will be inclined to regard the events of the past, as well as those of the present, from the standpoint of their relation to Christ and Christianity. In vocal music, if the exercises that may be selected breathe the spirit of religion, they will foster in the pupils religious sentiment and emotion. These conclusions are simple consequences from the laws of association, no less than

observations of experience. In the lesson in history on the Discovery of America by Columbus, as the modern pedagogist declares—taking this as an illustration to be applied, *cæteris paribus*, to all the other studies—the teacher is to “make use of arithmetic, geometry, geography, natural history, literature, and drawing, as a means of developing interest in the class and giving a comprehensive notion of the event.”¹ But why, we ask, omit religion from the list? It clearly belongs there, both because it is bound up with the historic circumstances of the event, and because of the splendid opportunity offered for impressing upon the pupils an idea of the beneficent influence of Christianity in the world.

Religion is the most comprehensive subject in the curriculum. It has a wider range of correlating power than any other subject. It can be brought into the reading lesson, as into the writing exercise; into language lessons and literature, as well as history; into nature-study and drawing; into art and music; and even, to some extent, into the study of arithmetic.² Religion, according to the Catholic view, should have part in the teaching of all the branches of the curriculum, in so far as this is reasonably possible; just as, on

¹ *Cyclopedia of Ed.*, I, p. 143.

² Shields, *The Teaching of Religion*, p. 26.

the other hand, in teaching religion, symbols, analogies, and illustrations of spiritual truths must be drawn from nature, from art, from history and personal experience, from literature and all other sources available, if the work is to be done effectively. Only thus can the expanding ideas of the plastic youthful mind attain fullest development, while becoming "compacted and fitly joined together," according to the fundamental laws of mental growth. Religious principles can never rightly be excluded from any occupation, activity, or interest of a truly Christian man; and to this end it is essential that there should be established the most intimate correlation between religion and the secular occupations, activities, and interests of the child and the youth. "The teacher," says Herbart, "must represent the future man in the boy; consequently, the aims which the pupil will as an adult place before himself in the future must be the present care of the teacher; he must prepare beforehand an inward facility for attaining them."¹

It must be admitted that Catholic educators have not, as yet, fully succeeded in establishing this intimate correlation between religious instruction and the other studies of the curriculum. The

¹ Herbart, *The Science of Education*, translation by H. M. and E. Felkin, p. 109.

general idea of correlation has been instinctively grasped; but it has not always been consistently carried out. In many schools, the teaching of religion is confined almost exclusively to the catechism class. Where Catholic text-books are used in history, reading and literature, and geography, as is now frequently the case, a notable improvement has been effected. But very much remains still to be done. There is needed, on the part of many Catholic teachers, a more thorough knowledge of the psychological laws of association, and a closer study of their application through the principle of correlation. Catholic text-books are very desirable; but, in the hands of a teacher who does not understand their fundamental purpose, they may be of little or no service. On the other hand, a teacher who realizes the importance of investing every study and every class, so far as possible, with a religious spirit and interest, will know how to do this effectively even without the aid of text-books. Incidental correlation depends for its success upon the teacher.¹

If the psychological laws of association require

¹ A new series of Catholic readers, which admirably exemplify this principle of incidental correlation, has issued recently from the Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C. The author of the series is the Rev. Dr. T. E. Shields, of the Catholic University.

that religion, if it is to be taught at all, should be taught in the school and correlated with the other subjects, what is to be thought, from our present point of view, of the omission of religious instruction altogether in the school, and its relegation to the Sunday school? From what has been said, it is evident that the result of the omission will be, that the ideas derived from the secular school and the ideas derived from the Sunday school will tend to remain without causal connection in the pupil's mind. There will be the large circle of secular ideas and interests, represented by the long list of regular school studies, and the five full days each week devoted to these; and there will be the smaller circle of religious ideas and interests, represented by the single weekly class, for a single hour. Not that the two sets of ideas, secular and religious, will remain in the mind altogether unassociated. This would be impossible. The religious lessons drawn from the Sunday school will react, more or less, upon the mental content derived from the regular school work. But *the respective processes of apperception*, secular and religious, are without connection; and the advantage that would be gained by their correlation—precisely the same as is gained in the case of the secular studies by *their* correlation—is altogether lost.

But this negative effect is not all. There is a positive evil effect resulting from the omission of religious instruction in the school. The course of study is a great object lesson. The work of the school, with the large space it occupies in his life, comes gradually to be regarded by the pupil as comprising the things of utmost value for him in the future. The fact that religion is left out of the program cannot fail to impress him. Will he not be inclined to draw the conclusion that religion is either something superfluous, or something that is, at any rate, without necessary connection with everyday life?¹ A non-Catholic educator has directed attention to this danger in the following words:

One of the first practical dangers of society is that the greatest truths that bear on human life shall come to be identified in the public mind with Sundays, churches, and Sunday-school. We certainly are helping that when we provide that the most aroused activities of a boy's mind shall be divorced from those truths, and that the subjects of science, literature, and history, with which the church and Sunday school cannot deal, shall be taught with a studied absence of reference to "the Divine Intelligence at the heart of things." What is this but a lesson in the practical atheism that shuts God out of all but certain selected parts of life with which the young man may have as little to do as

¹ Very Rev. E. A. Pace, Ph.D., *Modern Psychology and Education (Educational Briefs, Phila.)*, p. 21, reprinted from *Cath. World*, Sept., 1905.

he pleases. What would be the effect upon a child's mind of excluding studiously all mention of his earthly father from his work and play for five or six days of the week, of treating all his belongings and relations without reference to the parents to whom he owes them, and permitting such reference only on stated times when they are declared in order?

But the monstrosity and the mischievousness of such an arrangement would be as nothing to the scholastic taboo of the living God, to whom the child owes every breath of its daily life, who lies about it as a great flood of life and light seeking to enter in and possess its spirit, and who as much feeds its mind with knowledge and wisdom as its spirit with righteousness, and its body with earthly food, in providing "food convenient for it."¹

Another series of psychological data that bear upon the question of teaching religion in the school, is summed up in the general pedagogical formula of,

THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE SCHOOL

By the atmosphere of a school is meant, the sum of the educative influences at work, outside the formal instruction. These indirect agencies constitute the very life-blood of the school. It is their silent, subtle, persistent impress upon the

¹ Rev. Robert Ellis Thompson, Pres. of Central High School, Philadelphia, in *Divine Order of Human Society*, pp. 189, 190 (quoted in art. on *The School Question* by Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, in *Catholic Citizens and Public Education*—pamphlet).

will and heart that begets character. Chief among them is the influence of the teacher, not as a teacher, but as a man or woman, with a definite character, definite views, and definite manner of life. The pupils, also, influence each other: character, habits, views, conduct, manners, and home surroundings—all combine to produce individual as well as social influence. The schoolroom itself, with its walls and floor and furniture, has its effect; and it may be made to convey lessons of order, neatness, virtue and religion day by day, silently, but none the less surely, through appeal to the eye and the æsthetic sense.¹

The influence exercised by teacher and pupils in these indirect ways is largely due to the imitative instinct, which, as psychology has shown, impels the pupil to copy the behavior of other human beings, and, especially, the teacher—"a model far more suggestive, in word and look and deed, than the plainest admonition or the strictest rule of discipline."² To the laws of mental association and sense-perception are due the effects produced by the appointments and adornments of the schoolroom.³ The bare crucifix on the wall,

¹ Burns, *Principles, Origin, and Establishment of the Cath. School System*, p. 26.

² Pace, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

³ *Ib.*, p. 7 *seq.*

in a Christian school, is as clearly an expression of psychological laws as it is of religious devotion, for what other symbol is so rich in spiritual and religious motives for the mind and heart of the Christian youth? Time, of course, is needed for the fruitful operation of these indirect educational agencies, the effect of each upon the mind and will being due to the cumulative action of a long series of impressions, which may be largely unperceived.

In the Catholic school and college, these indirect agencies are rightly held to be of very great value, especially for the development of religious and moral character; and every effort is usually made to secure their realization under the best conditions. (Thus, as regards teachers, the vast majority of those engaged in Catholic schools and colleges are men and women who are devoted to the service of religion by profession. They belong to the religious orders, and wear a garb which symbolizes their sacred calling. They have had to undergo a probation of at least two years' duration, the object of which was not only to prove their religious vocation, but also to foster the growth of their spiritual life. They realize fully that the most important thing in the training of the young is their religious and moral formation. They teach without any personal remuneration. Such teachers must appear

to their pupils as concrete, living evidences of the supreme worth of spiritual realities as compared with material things. Their very character is thus calculated to diffuse the spirit of religion. It is not too much to say that it is psychologically impossible for the pupil, be he what he may, to remain under the influence of a teacher of this kind, without some corresponding effect upon his life and character. So clear is this to the Catholic mind, that the laity no less than the clergy have always manifested an eager preference for religious teachers; and lay teachers, who were numerous in the schools up to the middle of the last century, were rapidly replaced by members of religious orders, once a way was found to secure these in sufficient numbers.¹ There are, of course, many lay teachers still in Catholic schools and colleges; but it is regarded as essential that they be of unexceptionable moral character and of a truly religious spirit. No Catholic school or college would be likely to tolerate a serious defect in respect to either of these two qualifications.)

The atmosphere of religion is also furthered by the generality of the pupils being of the Catholic faith. The character and habits of a pupil are apt to have a profound influence upon his companions. In close companionship, this influence may some-

¹ Burns, *op. cit.*, pp. 277, 289, 301, 325.

times be far greater than even that of the teacher. All experienced parents and teachers know this. Certain souls possess this power of influencing others to a remarkable degree. Every school has its "leaders." Are these all-important facts not to be taken into account in planning for the interests of religion? Catholics have consistently reckoned with them; and this is the reason why personal character is always emphasized in the requirements of their schools and colleges. (Not only must the great majority of the pupils be of the Catholic faith, but clean moral character is regarded in every Catholic educational institution as a necessary qualification for the pupil's entrance and stay. A Catholic school or college could not consistently tolerate a pupil known to be irreligious in temper or unclean in moral life.)

Catholic instinct has also grasped the importance of symbolical and artistic imagery as an aid to instruction in religion. There is no classroom in any Catholic educational institution without the crucifix hanging conspicuously before the eyes of all, and there is seldom a wall that does not bear its share of religious pictures. Pupils may not apparently notice such things. Their effect will naturally be greater upon some than upon others. But upon each and all they are inevitably bound to exert a certain measure of religious

influence, at least as complementary parts of a whole. Experience shows that the memory of such symbols often persists, long after the knowledge gained during school days has been forgotten.

There are other elements that enter into the religious atmosphere of the Catholic educational institution, such as the recitation of a prayer in common before and after class, before and after meals, and at the beginning and end of each school day. These are, however, direct acts of prayer and worship, akin to the formal religious services in church or chapel, and the psychological principles they embody need no exposition here.

The effect of the religious atmosphere, as well as of its absence, may be aptly summed up in the words of a well-known Catholic educator. He has in mind the college, but the description is not less applicable to the school:

The young man attending the secular university from which the name of God is banished may easily come to forget God. The very fact that religion, which in his home and amongst his people stood as the most important and solemn fact of human life, is there ostentatiously passed over, is itself a great shock to his faith. Constant intercourse with professors whose learning he admires and who are known not to be religious men, little by little gnaws at the vitals of faith as a cancer works death upon the body. Daily intercourse with students who have no religious faith and, perhaps, even deride religion altogether, comes after

a while to paralyze the instincts and impulses of religion. It is not human reason which works this result; it is the mere pressure of the atmosphere around him. It is not that science is the enemy of faith, but that teachers of science, themselves without faith, by persistent reiteration of their own infidel opinions, suggest the belief that learning has no fellowship with faith. The hero-worshipping youth, measuring his untrained and callow mind against the mature intellect of the professor, observing that the professor finds no place for religion in his life, may come after a while to believe that religion is not the all-important thing he fancied it.

In the Catholic college, on the other hand, he finds himself surrounded by learned and virtuous men to whom the Christian faith is the vital fact of existence. He will find religion, not only in church and chapel, but in the daily lecture, in daily conversation, touching, as it should touch, life at every point. Fellow-students share with him this glorious faith; devotions are performed in common; the truths of religion and the forms of prayer mingle honorably in the conversation all around him, and here the world is full of God and the atmosphere is brightened with His name and His praise.¹

¹ Rev. John W. Cavanaugh, C.S.C., D.D., President of the Univ. of Notre Dame, Sermon, Sept. 21, 1913 (*Notre Dame Scholastic*, XLVII, 1).

CHAPTER IV

INNER RELATIONS

ORGANIZATION

THE Catholic parish school, high school, and college in the United States were founded independently of each other, and, generally speaking, they have developed along independent lines. The parish school system was established by the bishops and parish priests, and has remained subject to their authority. Most of the colleges and larger high schools were founded by the religious orders, and are consequently under their direction to a great extent if not wholly. During recent years, a number of the bishops have founded diocesan high schools. Where this has been done, it has been easy to effect an organic connection between the high schools and the neighboring parish schools. But the great majority of the better high schools are still unconnected with either the parish schools or the colleges in any organic way.

In these general statements, no account is taken of certain special relationships that may exist between these institutions. For instance, Cath-

olic colleges generally have their own high schools or preparatory departments in organic connection with the collegiate departments. Again, where religious orders have a college, they usually have charge of the parish in which it is located; and the school of this particular parish may thus be brought into touch with the preparatory department and the college. So, too, teaching Brothers or Sisters often have charge of the elementary school and the high school in the same parish, and where such is the case the two schools are naturally brought into close relationship. But such exceptional conditions have conducted but little towards the unification of Catholic educational work over the entire broad field.

The American college seems destined, by its nature and traditions, to stand apart, independent of high school and elementary school. If it were desirable to connect these three institutions as organic parts of a general educational scheme or system, as has been done in European countries, this could probably be effected with less difficulty in the case of Catholic institutions than in that of others. It is very doubtful if it would be for the best interests of the American college to be so connected with the under schools. But there can be no question as to the desirability of a close connection between the elementary school and the

high school. Such a relationship has long existed between the public high school and the public elementary school. The two are under the same control, and their respective curricula are so arranged that the work of the one prepares for, and fits into, the work of the other. The advantages of this arrangement are obvious. The benefits that would accrue to Catholic elementary schools and high schools by being closely connected, as component parts of the diocesan educational system, are not less clear. These benefits have, in fact, been fully realized and appreciated wherever this condition has been brought about.

COOPERATION

There is, however, another and an even more important kind of relationship between educational institutions than that of which I have been speaking. There is a moral unity that manifests itself in cooperation, or mutually helpful effort directed towards the attainment of common ends. Happily, this spirit has characterized our educational work to a notable degree. It will be shown that the tendency has always been towards a more perfect realization of the spirit of union and harmony. But, in a work like Catholic education, whose scope is so vast, whose schools, colleges and other institutions were so little connected in origin,

and which is being carried on under conditions so varying, it would be unreasonable to expect complete moral unity to be everywhere attainable, except with the aid of the slow processes of time. In saying that much still remains to be accomplished in this way, I am, therefore, only stating in other terms that our educational development is still incomplete, and that further time and effort are required to bring it to full maturity. The purpose of this Chapter is, to point out the places where this further development is most urgently needed, and to suggest the means by which it may best be brought about.

The question of the relations of the college and the parish school may be passed over for the present, since their respective interests appear to be so far apart. With the college and the high school, however, the case is different. They clearly have mutual interests. The high school curriculum should fit into the college curriculum, or, at least, be capable of preparing effectively for it. The Catholic high school should direct its graduates by preference to the Catholic college; the college should keep in close touch with the high school. Yet, until quite recently, the Catholic college and the Catholic high school stood far apart. The colleges, with their own preparatory departments, manifested little interest in other secondary schools.

When, a couple of decades ago, Catholic high schools began to increase rapidly in number, no effort was made by the colleges to get in touch with these new institutions. It was only after the Catholic Educational Association was organized, and it was shown by investigation that many of the new high schools were being affiliated to the non-Catholic colleges and state universities, that Catholic colleges began to take an active interest in the high-school movement. A resolution expressive of sympathy with this movement was offered at one of the early meetings of the Association, but it met with decided opposition, and several years passed before the colleges came to realize that the resolution merited approval. College men appeared to fear that the new high schools menaced their own preparatory departments.

Much the same has been the situation with regard to the high schools and the elementary schools. Until recently, nearly all the high schools were conducted by the religious orders, and had no direct connection with the neighboring parish schools. Each high school had its elementary department, and became, to this extent, a rival of the parish schools. It enrolled pupils whom the pastors wished to see attending their own parish schools until the completion of the eighth grade.

The elementary departments thus became a source of weakness to the high schools, and served to alienate from them the sympathy and support of the pastors. Like the preparatory departments in the colleges, these elementary schools have been maintained to serve as feeders for the higher departments, and to increase the financial receipts. Whatever may be thought of the continuance of the preparatory departments in the colleges—a subject that will be discussed later on ¹—there is little to justify the continuance of the elementary departments in the high schools, save in exceptional circumstances. They are no longer necessary as feeders to the high schools, and any loss of revenue their discontinuance might entail could be supplied by increased attendance in the high school proper, brought about through the cultivation of closer relations with the parish schools.

Even aside from this cause of friction, however, existing Catholic high schools often fail to obtain the recognition and support they deserve, except where, as in Philadelphia and some other places, the high school is under the direct control of the Ordinary of the diocese, and thus has a diocesan character. A zealous pastor, after building up a high school with much trouble and expense, finds that, gladly as he would welcome pupils from other

¹ See Chapter VIII.

parishes, the attendance is confined strictly to his own parish; and he thus succeeds only in adding one more to the already large number of parish high schools. Frequently, a number of such parish high schools are to be found in the same city, each with a small enrollment, when their combined enrollment would no more than suffice for a single strong school. The result is, to say the least, anything but conducive to efficiency and economy in education.

CAUSES OF LACK OF COOPERATION

What are the causes of this lack of cooperation between parish school, high school, and college, united, as they are, by religious bonds as well as by their ultimate educational purpose? Some of the causes have already been mentioned. Criticisms of the college that are occasionally heard would suggest the conclusion that the college is actuated only by a narrow individualism in its dealings with the lower schools. The same attitude has been attributed by a Catholic editor to parish priests and bishops in their treatment of the broader needs and interests of the Church:

The blight of parish individualism is at our roots. . . . We are a string of parishes and dioceses instead of a living organism. We have the unity of faith and authority—as for the rest we pull apart, hither and thither. Each bishop

has his own ideals, notions and projects, and each parish is stamped with an individualistic narrowness that bodes not well.¹

It must not be forgotten, however, that the diocese, the parish, and the college are bound by their very nature to be, to some extent, self-centered. This, in itself, would be no obstacle to their effective cooperation. There is another explanation for this lack of cooperation—I refer, of course, only to education—an explanation that is more just, as it is likewise more in accord with all the facts. The condition, where it does exist, is generally traceable to the peculiar difficulties which attended the growth of the Church throughout the United States, and which compelled bishops and priests to concentrate their attention upon local and immediate educational problems of pressing importance, to the exclusion or neglect, for the time being, of more general educational interests.

It was, in fact, utterly impossible in the beginning for the bishops, parish priests, and religious superiors to establish or devise a comprehensive system of education that should include all Catholic institutions. They were wholly preoccupied with problems that involved the very existence of

¹ *The Monitor*, Newark, N. J., quoted in *New Century*, Jan. 17, 1914.

those institutions for which they had direct responsibility. Nor was effective organization or even cooperation feasible, the existing schools and colleges being so few and so widely scattered. These conditions changed but very slowly during the first fifty years following the American Revolution. When the great tide of Irish and German immigration set in, towards the middle of the Nineteenth Century, the material side of the educational work that had already been accomplished had to be begun all over again. It became once more a question of building schools and colleges and providing for their maintenance. And the money for the schools had all to be obtained from the free-will offerings of the people. It was not until towards the time of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in 1884, that the condition of Catholic education made it possible for the bishops and religious superiors to give special attention to its more general needs, and to provide for its better organization.

The work of organization was really taken in hand just as soon as it was practicable. It will be instructive to recount

WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

by way of organization and cooperation in the period that has elapsed since then.

As early as 1852, Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann, of Philadelphia, was endeavoring to systematize the educational work of the parishes in his diocese; but events proved that the time was not yet ripe for this. A real diocesan system of education, involving supervision and examination of all parish schools by a diocesan school board, was established by Bishop Joseph Dwenger, of Fort Wayne, in 1879. This plan was adopted by other bishops, approved by the Fourth Provincial Council of Cincinnati, three years later, and became the basis of the school system imposed upon all the dioceses by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.¹ Since then, the work of perfecting this diocesan school system has made steady progress. The chief improvements introduced have been, the placing of the practical work of supervision in the hands of one man, the superintendent of schools, as the executive officer of the diocesan school board; and the bringing of the religious teachers more effectively within the influence of the superintendent, through the institution of a board of assistants to him known as community inspectors of schools.²

¹ Burns, *Growth and Development of the Cath. Sch. System*, p. 199 seq.

² *Ib.*, 207 seq.; Wright, *Roman Catholic Schools*, in *Rep. of Comm. of Ed.* for 1912, I, p. 230.

A movement towards the establishment of secondary schools as a part of the diocesan school system was inaugurated by Thomas E. Cahill, of Philadelphia, by the founding of the Central High School for Boys in that city, in 1873.¹ The school was amply endowed, and provided accommodation for over four hundred pupils. This important step in the direction of better educational organization has exercised a wide and permanent influence. In several other dioceses, similar central high schools have been founded under diocesan control. Many of the bishops are but awaiting a favorable opportunity to carry out the same plan. Philadelphia has recently witnessed the establishment of a large sectional high school for boys and of a central high school for girls, the teaching staff of the latter institution being composed of members of four distinct communities of nuns.² Such facts are evidence of the perfection to which the diocesan school system has been brought in that historic cradle of Catholic education.

Nor have efforts been wanting to bring the dioceses and the colleges into closer touch. In 1906, with this end in view, a committee appointed by the Catholic College Conference appeared before the archbishops at their annual

¹ Burns, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

² McDevitt, *Ann. Rep.* for 1912-13, p. 8.

conference in Washington. As a result, three archbishops were selected to meet a committee of prominent college educators, at the Milwaukee Convention of the Catholic Educational Association, during the following summer. It was hoped by many that such a discussion would lead to further conferences of the same kind, and, perhaps, to regular annual meetings. Unfortunately, the topics to be discussed jointly were not agreed upon beforehand, and the meeting was without definite advantageous results.

Much has been done, however, towards bringing the dioceses and the colleges into closer educational relations through the work of the Catholic Educational Association. The beginnings of the Association, which dates from the year 1899, were feeble enough; but, with the aid and encouragement of the bishops, it has grown larger and stronger year by year. Its policy has been to bring representatives of the schools, high schools, colleges and seminaries into active cooperation, through joint discussions of the larger and more common problems of Catholic education, while leaving to each affiliated conference or section all matters pertaining to its own proper sphere. Outside of the general conventions, it provides for meetings from time to time of representatives of the colleges and schools, and of the colleges and seminaries, for

the consideration of questions affecting the relations of these respective institutions. The work of these joint committees, besides being directly and practically helpful, has contributed much to the cultivation of the spirit of cooperation. The Association has thus become a practical bond of union between all Catholic educational agencies.

LINES OF FUTURE PROGRESS

The developments that have been noted, in the way of educational organization and cooperation, indicate clearly the lines of progress for the future. It is evident that there is need of closer educational relations between the colleges and the pastors, between the colleges and the communities engaged in secondary education, and between the colleges and the bishops.

The pastor is usually in charge of the education of Catholic children up to their fourteenth year, and he is likely to have considerable influence in the selecting of the college for the boy, and the academy for the girl. If the schools are to be brought closer to the colleges, it is, therefore, necessary that the cooperation of the pastors should be secured. Causes of friction, however slight in themselves, should be studiously avoided or removed. Much could be effected through friendly visits to neighboring parish schools by

members of a college faculty. Pastors are especially pleased to see representatives of the colleges present at the closing exercises of the schools in June, and at other formal school exercises during the year. Their mere presence is an encouragement, and tends to enhance the importance of the parish school in the eyes of the people. And what is more fitting than that such sympathy and support should be freely given to the heads of the parish schools by our highest academic authorities? It is not too much to assert that many hundreds of Catholic boys who make their way annually to non-Catholic colleges might be drawn to our own colleges, if the authorities of the latter would take more pains to manifest, in practical ways, their interest in the parish schools.

Pastors, on the other hand, ought to interest themselves in every grade of Catholic education, seeing that the same principle and purpose runs through it all, and that the parish schools and the colleges must ultimately stand or fall together. Organizations such as the Catholic Educational Association should enlist the name and active support of every priest who has responsibility for a Catholic school. Within recent years, a course of lectures in pedagogy and school management has been introduced into a number of the leading seminaries. This new movement promises much

for the parish schools of the future, and it will probably be of scarcely less benefit to the colleges. A pastor who has an enlightened interest in the educational work of his own school, can hardly fail to have a lively interest in the success of the Catholic college.

All this is equally applicable to the colleges and high schools. It is indispensable that college authorities should cultivate the most friendly and sympathetic attitude towards the teaching communities engaged in secondary education. The greatest need of the teaching communities, especially the brotherhoods, is vocations. Their novitiates and houses of study should, therefore, be objects of friendly solicitude to the priests of the college faculty, as well as to other priests of the same religious order who may be stationed in parishes. College men ought to take an active interest in the Catholic high school movement, and endeavor so to shape its development as to provide duly for the interests of the colleges. The high school can be made an effective link between the parish school and the college. Only through the high school, in fact, can anything approaching a thorough and systematic organization of all our educational efforts be expected.

It is, however, to the bishops that we must look

for the solution of some of the most difficult problems involved in the completion of the work of Catholic educational organization and cooperation. The bishops have control over the diocesan educational systems, including elementary schools and high schools. Without them, little can, therefore, be done towards bringing schools and colleges into closer touch. Through their authority and influence, on the other hand, any desirable degree of organization and cooperation should not be unattainable.

A few years ago, the bishop and parish clergy of the Diocese of Springfield, Mass., erected a handsome dormitory building at Holy Cross College, as a gift from the diocese. The spirit that prompted this generous action is, no doubt, an asset of even greater value to the institution than the material structure donated. Since then, the bishop and priests of one of the western dioceses have undertaken a similar benefaction for the college in the diocese. It is, of course, not to be expected that such benefactions will be possible everywhere. But the same sympathetic relations between college and diocese are surely realizable everywhere. The success of the Catholic colleges is of vital importance for religion. Without an educated laity whose life-principles are grounded in Catholic philosophy, and whose minds are trained to

instinctive sympathy with everything Catholic, the Church in America would be deprived of her main arm of defense. Nor could the parish schools long survive the colleges. Experience has abundantly shown that, in this country at least, Catholic laymen of this stamp are not apt to be the product of non-Catholic colleges or universities.

But apart from the needs of the colleges, there are many defects in Catholic education that would find a remedy, if the efforts of college authorities and members of the hierarchy were united more closely in active cooperation. A number of these defects have been pointed out in the course of the present Chapter. Our colleges and universities must be looked to for that broad, deep, philosophic knowledge of education, in its various processes, which is derivable only from a study of the subject in institutions of higher learning. They must supply the element of academic leadership. But professional knowledge and experience will avail little for the proper organization of the vast and complex work of Catholic education in the United States, without the active cooperation of the bishops. Proper organization will result in strengthening individual seminaries, colleges, and schools. It should go far towards stopping the drift of Catholic youth of both sexes

towards non-Catholic institutions of every kind. It will prevent untold waste of effort at many points, by linking all our educational institutions together in closest moral union, if not in a single comprehensive system.

CHAPTER V

TEACHING THE CHILDREN

THE DIOCESAN SYSTEM¹

CATHOLIC elementary education is organized along diocesan lines. Each of the dioceses has its own school system, at the head of which is the bishop. The bishops are bound by the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which has established an educational norm for all the dioceses in essential matters, and the diocesan school systems are consequently very much alike. Usually, one hears only of *the* Catholic school system. Unity and variety, stability and elasticity are thus provided for in Catholic elementary education, in much the same way as they are secured in the civil order by the division of authority between the Federal Government and the States.

In accordance with the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the control of the diocesan school system is vested in the diocesan

¹ For the number of elementary schools, pupils and teachers, cf. Chapter I, *supra*, p. 2.

school board, which consists of a number of the more influential clergy, presided over by the bishop. Most of the larger dioceses now have an inspector or superintendent of schools as the executive officer of the school board, and many of them have also community inspectors of schools. The community inspector is practically an assistant superintendent, with supervision over the schools that are in charge of his or her religious community within the diocese.¹

The pastor is, by right, the head of the parish school. In some respects, he is the most important factor in the entire school system. Apart from matters relating to the material and religious well-being of the school, however, the teachers have full charge of the work, and when they are religious, as is generally the case, the actual principal of the school is their immediate religious superior. The religious teachers usually live in or near the school building, which is almost invariably in close proximity to the parish church.

¹ For an account of the development of the organization of the diocesan school system, cf. the author's *Growth and Devel. of Cath. Sch. Sys.*, p. 199 seq. For a discussion of the problems connected with diocesan supervision, cf. paper of Rev. E. F. Gibbons, *School Supervision—its Necessity, Aims, and Methods*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, II, p. 164.

Besides eight-grade elementary schools, the diocesan school system includes kindergartens and high schools. Of late years, Catholics have been giving more attention to the establishment of kindergartens, and in many dioceses the kindergarten class has become a regular feature of the parish school. Experience shows that children who have had a good kindergarten training progress more rapidly in the lower grades. Moreover, if they take kindergarten work in the public schools, they are likely to continue to attend these schools.¹

We have now to consider some of the more important questions in respect to the diocesan school system that are engaging the attention of Catholic educators.²

THE TEACHING

An experienced diocesan superintendent recently expressed the opinion, that the most urgent needs of the parish schools at present are, "Better teachers; more teachers, and better equipment; and the keeping of *all* Catholic children through the grades and the high school."³ Something has already been said about the efficiency of the train-

¹ Rev. A. V. Garthoeffner, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.* VIII, p. 340.

² Cf. Bro. John Waldron, *The Organization of a Diocesan School System*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, XI, p. 254.

³ Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, in letter to author.

ing of Catholic teachers, as compared with teachers in the public schools.¹ Satisfactory as is the training of our teachers, from this comparative point of view, there can be no doubt that the greatest need of the parish schools is still the better preparation of the teacher.

Educational experience proves the necessity of providing fully for the preparation of the teacher in the regular training course of the teaching order. All other plans are but makeshifts, and can bring but temporary or partial improvement. The training course, comprising the postulate, novitiate, and normal school proper, must be strengthened and developed, if the teaching in the schools is to be improved and vitalized. Such was the view of the Third Plenary Council, of Baltimore. One of the chief functions of the diocesan school board, as decreed by the Council, was to be the examination of teachers; and no lay teacher or member of a diocesan teaching community was to be allowed to teach, without having passed the examination of the diocesan board and received a teacher's diploma. The diploma was to be valid for five years. After this period, another and final examination was to be required.² The object was

¹ Chapter I, *supra*, p. 8 *seq.*

² *Conc. Plen. Balt. III Acta et Decreta*, n. 203; Burns, *op. cit.*, pp. 201, 211.

made plain: it was to provide a corps of better trained teachers for the schools, and, as a means to this, the work of the training course was to be strengthened and prolonged.

This plan, so far as relates to the examination and certification of teachers, has not proven a success. The scheme did not include non-diocesan communities, and in many dioceses the great majority of the teachers belong to this category. This, in itself, was almost a fatal drawback. Inherently, there is no more reason for subjecting diocesan communities to the requirements of examination and certification than there is for subjecting non-diocesan communities to such requirements. Again, no program of studies was drawn up by the diocesan boards for the community training courses, nor, indeed, could this reasonably be expected of the boards. Without a definite prescribed program of studies, as the subject-matter or basis for the examinations, it was inevitable that these, if held at all, should come to partake of the character of a mere formality.¹ As a matter of fact, responsibility for the preparation of the teachers has generally been left to the religious superiors. This is the situation at present.

The aim of the legislation of the Third Plenary

¹ Bro. John Waldron, *op. cit.*

Council on this point may, however, be attained by the diocesan authorities, through supervision of the program and work of the community training courses. This task will naturally fall to the diocesan superintendents. Far more effective than the scheme of examination and certification by the diocesan school board, will be the careful study of the community training courses by those in the diocese who are professionally competent—the superintendent and the community inspectors. Their united recommendations would have almost the force of laws; for no one of the many communities concerned would care to run the risk of being backward in a matter so important. Rarely, if ever, should it become necessary for the bishop to take up the matter personally with the religious superiors. Were there assurance as to the program of studies followed in the training courses, and the competency of teaching staffs, the examination of the candidates for teaching in the diocesan schools might well be left to the community authorities.

Not less important than the program of studies in the community training courses, is the education of the teachers who are to carry out that program. Experience has shown that a single very capable teacher in the normal school is able to raise the standard of teaching throughout the

entire community. A few thoroughly educated men or women, with the high ideals and noble enthusiasm that spring from the pursuit of the scientific study of education, will be able, through the training of young teachers in the normal school, to improve the quality of the teaching in hundreds of parish schools. Nor will their influence be confined to the particular community or diocese in which they labor. The most hopeful outlook at present for the improvement of the teaching in the parish schools is, that so many of the religious orders are endeavoring to educate very thoroughly their more gifted and promising young teachers.¹

The difficulties that stand in the way of a more thorough preparation of teachers for their work in the schools, come chiefly from the lack of a sufficient number of vocations to the teaching orders. Young religious, who are still far from the completion of the work of the normal school, are often sent out into the schools and academies to teach, with but slight prospect of ever being able to complete their education. Many of these would be capable of rendering incalculably more fruitful educational service, if they were more thoroughly trained. Their superiors may be willing enough to afford them this training; but there are not teachers enough for the schools and academies, as matters

¹ Cf. Chapter I, p. 11.

stand, and how can these young teachers be spared? No one can blame the religious superiors; yet, gifted minds are left undeveloped, and Catholic education is decidedly the loser by it in the long run.

It is true, in very many instances, that the schools are not sufficiently staffed. "More teachers," is the second urgent need of the parish schools, according to the superintendent quoted above. To be convinced of the truth of this, one need only visit the crowded classrooms of many of our city schools, especially in the primary department. Seventy, and even eighty, children may not infrequently be found in charge of a single teacher. In one of the larger western dioceses, a community that has charge of twenty-three schools has an average of fifty pupils to the teacher. In an eastern diocese, in which the parish school system may be said to be as well organized as it is anywhere else in the country, a community with thirty-seven schools has an average of fifty-four pupils to the teacher; another community, with five schools, has fifty-eight pupils to the teacher.¹ In schools for foreign nationalities, the disproportion is often still greater. One community, in charge of twenty-five Polish schools, has, on an average, only one teacher to every sixty-four pupils; another, with

¹ Reports of diocesan superintendents.

six schools, has only one teacher to every seventy pupils.¹

It is generally admitted that no teacher should have more than forty pupils, even in the primary grades, and that ordinarily the quality of the teaching is bound to suffer when the number becomes greater than this. The teacher is physically unable to attend properly to more than a limited number of pupils; and besides, there is the matter of ventilation, involving possible detriment to their health, application and *morale*. The fact that the evils of overcrowding may not be greater in the parish schools than they are in the public schools, is no excuse for indifference on our part in regard to these evils. The condition described, wherever it exists, is bad. To tolerate it is to run the risk of losing all the advantages of the Catholic school, and of allowing the self-sacrificing labors of devoted religious teachers to remain barren of fruit.

A short-sighted parochial economy is sometimes responsible for this condition. But more often it is due to the impossibility of obtaining a sufficient number of religious teachers. All the teaching communities are in urgent need of more subjects. All of them have demands every year for more teachers in existing schools, as well as offers of new schools. Hundreds of new parish schools might be

¹ Burns, *Growth and Devel. of the Cath. Sch. Sys.*, p. 317.

opened every year, if the communities could supply the teachers. Neither pastors nor people will be satisfied with lay teachers, as long as there is the possibility of getting Sisters or Brothers. Since fully one-half of the Catholic children of the land still attend the public schools, it is evident that the increase of the membership of the teaching orders is vitally connected with the interests of Catholic education in a quantitative as well as a qualitative way.

The novitiates of the teaching orders ought to contain twice as many candidates as they have at present. If all pastors would take an active personal interest in fostering such vocations, the total number in the novitiates could easily be doubled within a few years. There is no intention here of implying that there has been a neglect of positive duty on the part of the parish clergy. It is a question of duty only in the larger sense—of that finer priestly zeal that knows no parochial boundaries, and is ever stirred and quickened by the vital needs and supreme interests of the Church. The Catholic school system, as it stands, is the splendid product of such priestly zeal.

THE CURRICULUM

The school curriculum may conveniently be considered under two aspects, *content* and *length*.

The Catholic school has been affected by practically the same conditions as the public school, and Catholic educators are confronted by the same problems in regard to the curriculum as non-Catholic educators.¹ Thus, in respect to *content*, the parish-school curriculum has undergone much the same transformation as the public-school curriculum, and from the same causes. Over one-half of the studies in the parish school today represent additions that have been made to the curriculum since about the middle of the nineteenth century. The older or "formal" studies—reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and spelling, together with some geography and history—have retained their place; but alongside of them has been placed the long list of subjects known as "real" studies, representing language and literature, and the elementary arts and sciences. The teaching of the older branches has also, to a great extent, been transformed by the introduction of empirical methods.

The multiplication of studies in the school has resulted in overloading the curriculum, and the need of simplifying it is generally acknowledged. As to just how this is to be brought about, however, there are conflicting views. Some educators would simplify the curriculum by cutting down still

¹ Cf. Chapter I, p. 7.

further the time allotted to such studies as arithmetic and grammar, and by aiming at a unification of classwork and study through the application of the principle of correlation. Others favor the cutting out altogether of many of the "real" studies, or so-called "fads." Business men clamor for the "three R's"—for clerks who can write, spell, and figure well, whether they may know anything more or not. Many Catholics believe that, if more time were devoted in school to the old "formal" studies, our youth would have a better chance of securing good positions in the business world after they leave school.

Such arguments are plausible. They appeal to the practical instinct. Nevertheless, adjustment to one's environment, in this narrow, utilitarian sense, can never wisely be made the dominating principle in any general scheme of education. The reason is simple. Education must aim to develop and train the *whole* child—all his faculties or powers, all his emotions, senses, capacities. If we accept this view of the function of education, it would seem that the new or "real" studies are essentially required in the curriculum, inasmuch as they are calculated to develop powers that are left practically untouched by the older studies. In elementary education especially, the principle of direct utility must be applied with caution. Super-

ficial results naturally show themselves quickly. A boy who can figure, write, and spell better than another may not be nearly so well educated as the latter, and, in the long run, may fall far behind him in the race of life. The product of the modern educational process may be, as it is claimed, lacking in accuracy, definiteness and precision;¹ but this, if it be true, must result rather from the method than from the subject-matter made use of. Surely, the study of the sciences and drawing must tend to beget habits of accuracy, definiteness and precision not less than does the study of reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic.

It is not unlikely that the demand for the simplification of the curriculum will be satisfied, ultimately, through the more successful application of the principle of the correlation of studies. Simplification will be secured, both by the general arrangement of the subject-matter of instruction, and by incidental appeal to the knowledge derived from all the other branches in the study of any particular subject.²

The question of the proper *length* of the curriculum is one that is receiving much attention at the present time. Most American educators have come to believe that our elementary school course

¹ *Ed. Rev.*, XLVII, p. 106.

² Cf. Chapter III, p. 33.

is too long. There is abundant evidence that the work which the school now takes eight years to do, could, under proper conditions, be done in approximately six years; or, in other words, that two entire years are wasted in the educational process, between the beginning and the completion of the elementary school. As a result, it is pointed out, the American young man is two years older than the German or Italian youth when, after graduation from the university or the professional school, the real work of life is begun. On the Continent, there is a longer school day and a longer school year than with us, as well as more intensive study, and pupils there cover the ground of our eight-year elementary curriculum in a shorter time.¹

This view is shared by many prominent Catholic educators. The members of the Advisory Board of the Catholic Educational Association, in 1912, adopted a plan for the reorganization of elementary education which would involve the cutting down of the work to six years. Bro. John Waldron, for

¹ Cf. *Rep. Comm. of Ed.*, 1913, pp. XXIV-XXVI; *Rep. of Committee of National Council of Ed. on Economy of Time in Education* (Bull. No. 38, U. S. Bur. of Ed., 1913); *Ed. Rev.*, XLVII, p. 28 seq., *Experiences of an American Exchange Teacher in Germany*; Dr. Chas. L. Dana, address to Schoolmasters' Assn. of N. Y. City, *N. Y. Sun*, Jan. 25, 1914.

many years supervisor of the schools of the Brothers of Mary, in a paper read before the above-mentioned association, said:

Inasmuch as this paper calls for a completed elementary education at the end of the sixth year, it may be asked with reason whether such work can be done within six years. In many dioceses, and especially where there is excellent and effective diocesan supervision, it can; but, frankly said, in some schools it cannot be done, as long as certain obstacles are there to impede the work.¹

The Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, former superintendent of schools in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, is of the same opinion:

With better teaching, with proper conditions in our schools, smaller classes and a longer school term, the work that is now done in eight years, and done sometimes badly, can be done well in six years. Two years of school life can thus be saved for higher studies.²

If two years of time are to be taken from the elementary school, what is the boy or girl to do after finishing the sixth grade? In answer to this question, it may be said that a number of plans are being tried. The one adopted by the Advisory Board of the Catholic Educational Association

¹ *How many Grades should there be in the Elementary School?*—*Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, VII, p. 290.

² In letter to the author Nov. 15, 1913. Cf. also, *The Present-day Tendencies in Education*, by Bro. John B. Nichol, S.M., in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, XI, p. 143.

involves a differentiation of curricula at the end of the sixth school year; pupils going on for high-school work would at once begin this, while the rest would devote two years to studies supplementary to those already had, together with manual training.¹ The plan of Junior and Senior High Schools involves the division of the high school into two sections, each of three years' length, and the admission of pupils into the lower section after their completion of the sixth grade.² This plan, however, will not result in shortening the entire academic period, unless the college should accept the work of the last two years of the high school in lieu of the work of its Freshman and Sophomore years.³ It is the contention of the Catholic educators quoted above, and of many experienced non-Catholic educators, that, under proper conditions, the work of the eight years' elementary school can be done in six years. If these conditions can be brought about, and two years of the elementary-school period saved, the boy or girl would begin

¹ Cf. Chapter VI, p. 108; also, *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, IX, p. 87; and the paper of Rev. Dr. F. W. Howard, on *The Problem of the Curriculum*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, X, p. 132.

² Cf. Rep. of the Committee of the National Council of Ed., on *Economy of Time in Education*, *loc. cit.*

³ For a fuller discussion of the Junior and Senior High School plan, see Chapter VI, p. 106.

high school work at the age of twelve or thirteen, and finish it four years later. There is no valid reason for prolonging the high-school period. The really important reform is the elimination of the enormous waste of time in the elementary school.

The conditions necessary, in order to bring about this reform, are, better teaching with smaller classes, more intensive study, a longer school day and school term, and the avoidance of whatever is opposed to economy of time. Under this last head, a long-standing abuse in Catholic schools is thus characterized by one who has had wide opportunities for observation:

Beyond any doubt, the greatest cause of loss of time in our educational work is the preparation for entertainments, as it is carried out in many schools, either for commencements or for purely financial purposes—especially entertainments in which, to secure a record attendance of parents and relations, every class, and when possible every child in the class, must appear on the stage, regardless alike of the histrionic incapacity of teacher and pupils for such work. I feel convinced that if diocesan school boards would get the actual statistics of the loss of time involved in the preparation of entertainments, every endeavor would be made to suppress them entirely, where possible, and to reduce them to a minimum where they must remain as necessary evils.¹

¹ Bro. John Waldron, *Grades in the Elementary School*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, VII, p. 281.

The length of both school day and school term has been cut down in Catholic schools, after the example of the public schools. It is clear now that this was a serious mistake. Pastors and teachers should set their faces resolutely in the opposite direction. It will take time to recover the lost ground, and this must be effected by a concerted movement. The cultivation of the habit of intensive study by pupils is dependent upon improvement in teaching and reduction in the size of classes. These matters have already been discussed.

KEEPING CHILDREN AT SCHOOL

The causes of the retardation and elimination of pupils in school have been carefully studied during recent years. Catholic schools appear to be affected by these causes quite as much as the public schools. A few years ago, an investigation that covered 386 of the larger cities of the country was made by the Sage Foundation. The results showed that of every eighteen pupils in the first grade, only ten appeared in the fifth grade, and five in the eighth grade, while only one out of the eighteen went on to the high school.¹ In one of our large dioceses, in which there are over 62,000 children enrolled in the parish schools, 37,000—over one-

¹ *America*, May 27, 1911, p. 165.

half of the entire enrollment—are in the first grade. Between the fourth and fifth grades, in the same diocese, the enrollment decreases by almost one-half. In passing from the sixth to the seventh grade, the enrollment is halved again, and the process is repeated in the passage from the seventh to the eighth grade. There are 92 per cent more children in the first than in the highest or eighth grade.¹

The conditions just described appear to be typical. This means that by far the greater number of pupils in our schools fail to gain the benefit of the full course of instruction and training, religious and secular, which has been provided for them at such great cost and sacrifice. Most of them drop out long before they come to the end of the course; a large proportion of those who stay lag behind in their work, and are kept much of the time going over the same ground. This is a dark shadow upon our schools. It is not brightened in the least by the fact that the public schools are suffering just as much in the same way. The efficiency of our entire school system is gravely imperiled.

The causes of retardation are closely allied with those of elimination. By law, children are gener-

¹ Rev. P. J. McCormick, Ph.D., *Retardation and Elimination of Pupils in our Schools*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, VIII, p. 326; cf. also, L. P. Ayres, *Laggards in our Schools*.

ally obliged to begin school at six to eight years of age and to attend school until fourteen to sixteen years of age. But parents who wish to evade the law, do not, as a rule, find it difficult to do so. The compulsory education laws differ considerably in the various States, and are enforced far less strictly in some than in others. In consequence, the proportion of children of school age who actually attend school differs very much throughout the country, ranging from 54.6 per cent in Louisiana to 92.9 per cent in Vermont and Massachusetts.¹

A superintendent of Catholic schools who has devoted special attention to the subject, enumerates the following five causes of retardation:

1. Late entrance.
2. Irregular attendance. Less than three-fourths of the children in the schools attend school as much as three-fourths of the year.
3. Physical defects.
4. Deficient school administration. Under this heading are placed overcrowding of courses and classes, loss of time, lack of discipline, faulty methods, inefficient teaching, and an irrational system of promotion.
5. A lack of understanding of the problem of retardation.

As remedies, he suggests that every possible effort should be made to get the children to school at an

¹ *Compulsory School Attendance*, Bull. No. 2, U. S. Bur. of Ed., 1914, p. 25.

earlier age, especially by the establishment of kindergartens; that regular attendance should be insisted on more vigorously; that courses should be revised so as to enable the *average* child to complete the grades; and that provision should be made for better school administration, in the large sense in which the term is used above.¹ To these remedies, another diocesan superintendent would add the following:

1. Special attention should be given to those who fall behind their grade, in order to discover the cause and to apply the best available remedy. While it is impossible under our present conditions to reach each child individually, yet with a little effort much can be done for those exceptional children who are to be found in every grade.

2. Intelligent, systematic medical inspection of the school will be an important factor in preventing certain evils and in eliminating others. It has been demonstrated time and again that the removal of physical defects helps towards the unfolding and developing of a child's intellectual powers.

3. There should be a radical correction of the overcrowding evil. Whatever excuse there may be for our inability to provide special remedies for the backward children, in nearly every case the overcrowding in our schools can be corrected if there be a sincere desire to do so. Not unfrequently non-essentials about a parish establishment are carefully looked after, while those things that concern the

¹ Rev. A. V. Garthoeffner, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, VIII, p. 336 *seq.*

health of both teachers and pupils are made to assume a secondary importance.¹

Measures thoroughly corrective of these evils will undoubtedly be beset with difficulties. But much improvement can easily be effected, provided there be an understanding of the conditions, and a tender sympathy for retarded or backward children, who are the most helpless and the most worthy of intelligent consideration.²

¹ Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, Phila., *Fourteenth Ann. Rep.*, p. 18.

² *Ib.*

CHAPTER VI

HIGH SCHOOLS FOR BOYS

CATHOLIC secondary schools are multiplying very rapidly, over one hundred having come into existence during the past three years.¹ These schools are evidently being opened in response to a popular demand. The movement is very significant, and full of promise for the further development of Catholic education.

TEACHERS

Nearly all Catholic secondary schools are taught by religious. Brothers have charge of 92 high schools, and Sisters teach in 473 high schools containing boys.² Although the parish priest would, as a rule, prefer to have men rather than women as teachers for boys of high-school age, yet he may find that he cannot get Brothers and cannot

¹ Cf. *The Condition of Cath. Secondary Ed. in the U. S.*, Aug. Bull. of Cath. Ed. Assn., 1915, p. 64. For a statement of the enrollment in Catholic secondary schools, cf. Chapter I, *supra*, p. 2.

² *Rep. on Cath. Sec. Ed.*, 1915, p. 64. High schools that are exclusively for girls will be discussed in the next chapter.

afford to hire laymen. On the other hand, if he has not a high school of his own, his boys will go to the public high school, where most of their teachers are likely to be women. Hence, he is often obliged to draw the practical conclusion that he cannot do better than to get Sisters to conduct the work of his high school. Moreover, in parish high schools conducted by Sisters, at least one class—Christian doctrine—is almost always taught by one of the clergy, who also looks after the discipline of the school. It is chiefly in regard to discipline and character-training that objection is raised against the teaching of boys by women. This objection is thus partly obviated in the case of these schools. While all this is true, the fact remains that men teachers are, by common consent, preferable for boys of high-school age. We would have a larger number of Brothers' high schools if we had more teaching Brothers. One of the greatest needs in Catholic education at the present time is an increase of vocations to the teaching brotherhoods.

RELATION TO CATHOLIC COLLEGES

Fully one-half of our high schools have courses in Latin, which is generally among the entrance requirements of Catholic colleges.¹ The standard

¹ *Report on Cath. Secondary Ed.*, 1915, p. 8.

college, as defined by the College Department of the Catholic Educational Association, must require sixteen units of specified preparatory studies for entrance.¹ According to this definition, which is also accepted by non-Catholic educational associations, most Catholic high schools that teach Latin have a curriculum that is capable of fitting boys and girls to enter our standard colleges. Many others are capable of preparing their pupils to enter the Freshman Year of colleges that are less strict in regard to entrance requirements. Only a few high schools teach Greek, unless they are directly connected with the colleges.

A very large proportion of our high schools, however, do not attempt to prepare pupils for college. In many instances, this is due to their recent establishment, or to the difficulty of attaining the entrance standards of the colleges. Such difficulties will probably be overcome in time. The secondary school, it is true, exists primarily for pupils who are not going to college. Its first duty is to them. But it will always have a certain number of pupils who are ambitious for higher studies. Statistics show that about one out of every ten pupils in the public high schools actually goes to college. A Catholic secondary school, therefore, cannot afford to neglect the interests

¹ Circular of College Dept., Feb., 1915.

of higher education, however much it may subordinate them to the needs of the greater number of its pupils, for such neglect would be abandonment of one of its own fundamental utilities.

Not only should the Catholic high school carefully provide for those among its pupils who are looking towards the college, but it should employ every legitimate influence to direct such pupils to *Catholic* colleges. Graduates of our high schools will, doubtless, continue to go to non-Catholic colleges. Local proximity, if no other cause, would lead to this. But Catholic colleges have a right to expect the great majority of these high-school graduates. It would be sad, indeed, if any of our middle schools, which ought to form the central link in the organization of Catholic education, should come to be a hindrance rather than a help to the passage of pupils from our parish schools to our colleges.

Probably one-half of the graduates of Catholic high schools who enter college go to non-Catholic institutions. These institutions make no discrimination between Catholic and public high schools. They are eager, as a rule, to place Catholic schools on their accrediting lists, when the schools meet their substantial requirements, and quite a number of our high schools are now accredited to various

state universities.¹ It is natural that high schools should seek recognition from standard collegiate institutions, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, for such recognition means much for their own standing as reputable secondary schools. The Catholic University has been quick to recognize the opportunity that this condition offers, as is shown by its long list of accredited Catholic high schools.

The determination of the relations that are to exist between college and high school depends more upon the former than upon the latter. There are several things that the Catholic college may do in order to attract the graduates of Catholic high schools, and prevent their being drawn to non-Catholic colleges and universities. First of all, there is the cultivation of friendly relations with the authorities of the high school.² It is personal influence, more than anything else, that counts in the selection of a college by the high-school student. Again, the high school may be brought into close academic touch with the college, so that the high-school diploma would admit its possessor, without examination, to the Freshman Year of the college, or to one of the upper preparatory years. Another bond of union is the

¹ *Reports on Cath. Sec. Ed.*, 1912 and 1915.

² Cf. Chapter IV, p. 52.

competitive scholarship, admitting the high-school graduate to free tuition or board, or both, in the college. A single competitive scholarship may attract many pupils to the college that offers it; and a number of such benefactions, attached to different high schools, will be sure to attract to the college a large proportion of their graduates who go on for higher education. Some of our colleges have already succeeded in establishing such scholarships, and many others are, doubtless, only awaiting opportunities for doing so.

RELATION TO PARISH SCHOOLS

There is a growing tendency to establish *central* high schools, or high schools connected with all the parish schools of a city or city district.¹ The number of Catholic central high schools now amounts to several dozen. In advocating their establishment, a diocesan superintendent describes the general situation very clearly as follows:

The difficulty of conducting high schools attached to single parish schools can be grasped once you note the cost of equipment, the securing of teachers specially qualified for the work, teachers who are sorely needed in the lower grades, and then see the small number of candidates who present themselves for secondary education, and the still smaller number who survive after four years' work. The

¹ Cf. Chapter IV, p. 58.

thin remnant of the elect who outlast the four strenuous years leads one to ask whether, after all, the game is worth the candle.

This situation is by no means peculiar to our diocese; it is widespread. Nay, more, it has been the chief cause of concern among our most able Catholic educators. Those who have devoted time and thought to this matter have but one conclusion, and that is the central high school. It has been tried and proved a splendid success. This solution has stood every test, answered every objection.¹

In most cases, the Catholic high school is either under the exclusive control of a particular pastor and draws its pupils from his parish alone, or it is independent of the parishes and under the control of a religious community. It is evident that, in the first case, unless the parish is a very large one, the high school will be small and weak. The cooperation of a number of parishes is generally necessary to ensure a fair high-school enrollment, as well as the requisite financial support.²

The independent high school in charge of a religious community is not an organic part of the strictly diocesan system. The parish schools around it have no direct connection with it, and their pupils do not necessarily look up to it as a school to which they are to go, as a matter of

¹ Rev. Joseph A. Dunney, *Ann. Rep. of Schools of Albany Diocese for 1914*, p. 28.

² Cf. Chapter IV, p. 53.

course, for the continuation of their studies.¹ Catholic high schools of this type are analogous to the "academies" which preceded the public high schools. The genius of the American public high school consists precisely in that which the "academies" lacked—an organic connection with the elementary school system, and the opportunity and inducement thereby offered to every elementary pupil to take up a higher course of studies, as the continuation and complement of the studies of the lower school. This advantage, which accords so well with the democratic spirit and institutions of America, is largely lost when the connection between the secondary school and the elementary schools is broken. This is not, of course, intended as an argument against the maintenance of the independent high schools. They are, on the whole, among our most valued and efficient educational institutions, and we cannot have too many of them; but they can never take the place of the central high schools. In order to secure the general support of the parishes, a high school must not be either under the exclusive control of any one of them, or altogether independent of them. All must have a common interest in it, and all must contribute to its support and success.

¹ For a discussion of the elementary departments attached to these high schools, cf. Chapter IV, p. 52.

These conditions can be brought about only through the influence or authority of the bishop.

In treating of the relationship that ought to subsist between the high schools and the parish schools, one of our foremost educators says:

The Catholic high school education of a city or town or locality should be carried on by the combined efforts of all the parishes of a city in the organization of a central high school, or by groups of parishes in the organization of sectional high schools. This policy opposes directly and emphatically that which makes an individual parish, with no relation to other parishes, responsible for high-school education. Many reasons might be added to demonstrate the soundness and efficiency of the policy which ignores parish limits, and coordinates the educational forces and the financial resources of all or many parishes.

First, a *central* school or a sectional school makes for economy in administration, in buildings, in equipment. Second, it conduces to greater efficiency in the teaching body, and, consequently, in the educational work which the school attempts to carry on. Third, it unconsciously counteracts the intolerance and narrowness which appear in the views of those whose whole education has been attained in the one restricted environment. Fourth, by bringing into closer relations groups of pupils from different parishes, and by exercising, therefore, an educational influence in the formation of character, it aids in preparing Catholic boys and girls for the more exacting trials which are met in the wider experiences of their chosen calling. Fifth, it affects radically, as experience has demonstrated in Philadelphia, elementary education, by erecting certain

definite educational standards which the parish schools endeavor to reach. Sixth, it radiates a unifying force in the development of a solidarity in public opinion which is lamentably weak among Catholics, in all questions except the one—religion.

On the other hand, the *parish* high school adds practically nothing to the permanent and systematic development of the general system of Catholic education. It is, perhaps, in this respect that the policy of solving the high-school problem through the individual and unrelated efforts of one parish shows its greatest weakness. Usually a parish high school owes its existence to the zeal and educational activity of a particular pastor. The school may fulfill its work as long as the living personality dominates its life. But there is always a reasonable fear that when the man who creates a parish high school dies or changes his pastorate, the high school will languish and gradually disappear. Thus, the energy, time and money which were expended in the individual high school, instead of being conserved and made contributory to the progressive growth of the school system, becomes a passing, transient force. It is self-evident that real progress in our school system is out of the question if an important part of it, such as the high-school department, endures and disappears as individuals come and go.¹

COST OF CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

The question of the cost of Catholic secondary schools is of particular importance, especially if they are to become central or sectional high

¹ Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, in *Ann. Rep. for Schools of Archd. of Phil.*, 1916.

schools. It may be observed that Catholic high schools are usually needed only where their support would be least felt as a burden. In country districts or towns, where the Catholic population is scattered or small, Catholic high schools are scarcely possible at present. The immediate need for them is in cities that contain a number of parishes, with large and flourishing congregations. In such places, the establishment of a central high school would entail much less expense than is commonly supposed.

It costs, generally speaking, only about one-third as much to maintain a parish elementary school as it does to maintain a public elementary school, and the same proportion holds good in the case of Catholic high schools and public high schools. But many of our present high schools cost much less than this proportion would indicate. Where the work is all done in the one parish-school building, there is practically no extra expense for building, heat, light, or janitor service, on account of the high school, and its cost amounts to no more than the salaries paid to the teachers. With four Sisters as teachers, the total cost of such a high school to the parish would amount to about \$1200 annually. As the salaries of Sisters are often less than \$300 a year, and as the parish high school often has less than four grades, its annual cost is,

in many instances, much less than the above figure. The cheapness of secondary education, under such circumstances, has led to the establishment of a large number of high schools attached to individual parish schools.

It is, however, with the cost of *central* high schools that we are chiefly concerned. In estimating the actual cost of maintaining a Catholic central high school, we may assume that such a school, with four regular grades and two commercial grades, will require six or seven teachers. If the teachers are Brothers, their salaries, at \$400 each, will amount to \$2800 annually. To this must ordinarily be added, for all other expenses, about 35 per cent of the salary-total, or the sum of \$980. The estimated total expense of a central high school would thus be \$3780 annually. With thirty pupils to each teacher, the per capita annual expense would be \$18. Were the teachers Sisters, with salaries of \$300 each, the total cost would be reduced to less than \$3000 annually, and the per capita expense to about \$14.

An annual expense of from \$3000 to \$4000 for a Catholic high school is more than any single parish is able to bear. But where a number of parishes would unite in support of such a school, the expense devolving upon each would be comparatively slight, amounting to only a few hundred dollars a

year.¹ It is desirable that the central high school should be a free school, supported by parish contributions rather than individual tuition-fees. As to the apportionment of the charges for its support among the parishes, there are obvious objections against assessing all the parishes equally. The assessment upon each parish might, however, be based on the number of pupils that attend the high school from it, or, better still, on the *parish school enrollment*. This latter plan would stimulate interest in the high school among the several parishes, and induce each to send as many pupils to it as possible, since the cost to the parish would be the same. On the other hand, to base the assessment on the *high school enrollment* from each parish, would expose certain parishes to the temptation of being satisfied with a small representation at the high school, to keep down expenses. Still, it is not to be expected that such problems will be solved everywhere in exactly the same way. Local conditions may have to be taken into account. A plan that works successfully in one place, might not work so well in another. The all-important thing is, that the high schools should, so far as possible, conform to the general type which experience has shown to be the best. The ideal condi-

¹ Cf. description of Cath. Central High School at Grand Rapids, Mich., in *Cath. Ed. Rev.*, I, p. 391.

tion, under existing circumstances, is represented by the central high school, established by the parishes, and supported by them according to some equitable and permanent plan.

PROPER WORK OF THE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Catholic high schools do not, as a rule, attempt to give manual training. It is given in a few of the larger high schools, and there are special manual training schools, like those of the Christian Brothers and the Xaverian Brothers. The more of such schools and departments we can have, under like conditions, the better. But, in the case of the ordinary Catholic high school, a manual training department is a practical impossibility. Its cost would forbid it, and, besides, it is entirely unnecessary. Neither is it necessary that the Catholic high school should include in its curriculum a number of other subjects that are now taught in public high schools. Studies like psychology, and advanced courses in mathematics, history, English, and the sciences, belong to the college. There is no room for them in the high school, unless room is made at the expense of the essential subjects, which fully suffice of themselves to occupy the four years. The overburdening of the curriculum in this way, with the resulting superficial teaching of the essential subjects has seriously

interfered with the efficiency of the public high schools, and is frustrating, to some extent, their very purpose.

Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in one of his annual reports deals at considerable length with the work of the American public high school.¹ His discussion of the relations of colleges and secondary schools has been characterized by the *Educational Review* as "the most comprehensive and sanest statement of the causes that have contributed to bring about the present unsatisfactory conditions that largely prevail."² In our haste to enrich the curriculum of the secondary school, Dr. Pritchett says,

We have, to some extent, lost our ideal of what education means. To learn a little about many subjects, to dip superficially into the study of English and Latin and chemistry and psychology and home economics, and a dozen other things, is not education. Only that human being has gained the fundamentals of an education who has acquired soundly a few elementary branches of human knowledge and who, in acquiring these, has so disciplined his mind that it is an efficient instrument ready to be turned to whatsoever task is set before it. The high-school student is led to believe that education is attained by learning a little

¹ *Fifth Ann. Rep. of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.*

² Vol. XLI, p. 422.

of each of many things; he gains, therefore, a superficial knowledge of many subjects and learns none with thoroughness. He lacks the hard fiber of intellectual discipline. Such a youth has not been educated. That only is education which sets a boy on the way to use his own mind for his pleasure and his profit; which enables him to attack a problem, whether it be in school or in business, and to think out the right answer. Education, rightly understood, is a power-producing process; and the serious indictment against the secondary-school system to-day is that its graduates do not acquire either discipline or power. The real struggle in the American high school is between that influence which makes toward thoroughness and that which makes toward superficiality; and if the high school is to become the true training-place of the people, the ideal of thoroughness must supplant the ideal of superficiality.

The boy who desires to enter college and the boy who desires to enter business alike need to be well grounded in fundamental studies and to gain a real mastery of a few things. It appears equally clear that the educational ideal which makes for a simple and thorough curriculum for the individual, serves equally well the boy who looks toward college and the boy who goes directly from the high school into a vocation.

Here, then, is our opportunity. So far from regretting our inability to rival in all respects the large public high schools, with their extensive equipment and numerous teaching staff, we may not unreasonably feel that our poverty is, in this matter, a safeguard. The Catholic high school does not need much material equipment, nor a

large teaching staff. It requires, above all else, competent, earnest and devoted teachers. A staff of from four to seven such teachers is amply sufficient for the ordinary central high school. It ought to have a business or commercial course, as well as the academic course. It should aim, as Dr. Pritchett says, at teaching only a few subjects, and at teaching these well. There can be little if any difference of opinion as to what these subjects ought to be, once it is agreed that they are to be few and that they are to be fundamental. Latin, English, history, mathematics, modern languages, and elementary science will form a simple but substantial curriculum. The Catholic high school should also, wherever possible, include in its curriculum the study of Greek; and this can easily be done, in many places, through the cooperation of the parish clergy. It will often, in fact, be much easier to provide courses in Greek than courses in the modern languages or science; and, for the boy who is looking forward to a college or seminary career, Greek will be far more profitable than either the modern languages or science.

REORGANIZATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL

There is quite a general agreement among American educators that a reconstruction of the curriculum of the high school is needed. This

conviction has been arrived at after many years of study and discussion of the matter. It is maintained that the age of twelve would be preferable to the age of fourteen for the transfer of the pupil from the elementary school to the high school, because the age of twelve corresponds more closely to the great change from childhood to youth which takes place during this period of his life. Moreover, much time is lost in the elementary grades; with better teaching and organization, the work that really belongs to the lower school could be completed by the age of twelve. Furthermore, the social and economic conditions which the American high school system was designed to fit into, have changed very greatly. The fundamental idea of the high school was, equal opportunity for all—knowledge being regarded as the equivalent of opportunity. This was well enough, as long as our great undeveloped natural resources, together with the comparative smallness of the population, made knowledge of even a general kind an easy pathway to success in life. To-day, however, this is no longer the case. Graduates of the high schools, in ever-increasing proportion, find themselves in a world where the vague and superficial knowledge they have acquired is rather a hindrance than a help. Parents who have the ambition to give their children a high-school education are

endeavoring, in their own way, to adjust this education to the changed outer conditions; and the greater number of pupils quit the high school after a year or two. Those who stay till graduation are but a small fraction of the vast number who enter. Plainly, the high school of to-day does not meet well the needs either of its pupils or of the times.

Some reconstruction or readjustment of the curriculum appears, therefore, to be necessary, while, at the same time, it is recognized that the general character of the high school and its important social function as a democratizing agency should, so far as possible, be preserved. But what form shall this reconstruction or readjustment take? How far shall it go? and how may it best be brought about? These are questions that are still to be decided. Several practical plans that involve a solution of them are being tried. The one that is most in favor just now is that of Junior and Senior High Schools, or, as it is sometimes called, the "Six and Six High School Plan." Its essential provisions may be shown by quoting the following resolutions adopted by the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan, in June, 1914:

That school authorities be encouraged to incorporate the seventh and eighth grades of the elementary school as

an integral part of the high school, forming a six-year system.

That high school authorities be recommended to organize the six-year high-school system into a Junior High School of three years and a Senior High School of three years, as soon as local conditions will admit.¹

The superintendent of schools of the State of Michigan has outlined courses of study to accord with these resolutions. Three years ago, the Federal Bureau of Education reported that thirty-one city superintendents of schools throughout the country had already adopted the plan or some modification of it. Objections to it have, of course, been made, chiefly on practical and economic grounds; but these objections do not appear, so far, to raise any very serious difficulties. An obvious advantage of the plan is the opportunity it would afford pupils to choose a definite line of work, suitable to their capacities and environment, in the seventh rather than in the ninth grade, with the prospect of their being thus induced to remain at school longer. The existing school laws would make it necessary for most of the pupils of the elementary schools to enter the Junior High Schools.

Some years ago a plan for the solution of this problem in our own schools was formulated by the Advisory Board of the Catholic Educational Asso-

¹ *School Review*, Sept., 1914.

ciation, and was formally adopted by the Executive Board in November, 1914, in the sense that it was recommended to Catholic educators as an embodiment of guiding principles. It has not thus far, however, been adopted by the general Association. The plan has reference only to boys, and is substantially as follows:

About the age of twelve, the parents, the teachers, and the children themselves should begin to look forward to the future, and select a kind of education in conformity with the purpose they have in view. We may divide our boys at this period into five classes.

Class I. Those who are called to the priesthood; those who intend to enter the liberal professions, law, medicine, education, journalism; those who wish a full liberal education. We should aim to give these boys the classical training, extending over a period of eight years, and including a course of two years in philosophy.

Class II. Those who expect to take up the technical professions—mechanical, civil, electrical, sanitary, or ceramic engineering, veterinary surgery, agriculture, etc. The classical training will not be so much in demand for these boys. The course should extend four or five years beyond the elementary schools, and then the special technical studies can be taken up.

Class III. Those who expect to enter business or commercial pursuits. Many of these may be induced to take the full course of secondary training. Our parish schools or our high schools can take care of those who wish a few years of training beyond the elementary period.

Class IV. Those who expect to enter the trades. We

should aim to keep these boys in our parish schools for two years after the completion of the elementary course.

Class V. Those who will engage in manual labor, and those who are backward and deficient in studies. These boys should be taken care of in our parish schools.

These proposals embody broad principles to be kept in view in reorganizing the curriculum, rather than a definite scheme of reorganization; and in this lies their chief merit. The time may or may not be ripe for the universal establishment of Junior and Senior High Schools; but the time has certainly arrived when pupils must have a definite aim in view sooner, and select work that will prepare them efficiently for its realization. There is no Catholic secondary school in which these recommendations may not, to some extent, be converted into actual practice at once.

The establishment of Junior and Senior High Schools would remedy certain of the defects that have been pointed out in Catholic secondary education. It would, for instance, promote the founding of strong central high schools, and keep pupils longer at school. The desire of the pastor to keep pupils in his own school as long as possible, could be carried out by his having a Junior High School. Every large parish might well have such a high school attached to the parish school; the more of them established, the better. After fin-

ishing the parish high-school course, pupils would pass to the Senior High School, located at some central point, for the higher course of three years. Although most of them would doubtless be content with the three years' course in the Junior High School, it is certain that a much larger number than at present would remain at school till the end of the ninth grade; and—more important still—the work of the seventh, eighth and ninth grades, as well as of the higher grades, could not fail to have a more definite and purposeful character for the greater number of pupils than it has to-day.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECONDARY EDUCATION OF GIRLS

SCHOOLS AND PUPILS

A STUDY of Catholic secondary education that was made in the year 1915 showed that we had then, all told, 577 girls' schools of secondary grade, with an enrollment of 27,858 pupils who had completed the eighth grade. Besides these schools, which are exclusively for girls, there are many Catholic high schools that contain both boys and girls, and it was found that 11,882 girls were enrolled in such institutions. The combined figures for the two classes of schools gave an enrollment of 39,740 girls in the 1276 Catholic secondary schools in the United States.¹ These numbers are impressive. A closer study of them, however, will show that, relatively speaking, the educational provision which they represent is not nearly so large or sufficient as it might at first appear.

It is to be noticed that the above figures indicate an average enrollment of less than fifty pupils

¹ Cf. *Cath. Secondary Ed. in the U. S.*, by the author, in *Aug. Bull. of Cath. Ed. Assn.*, 1915.

above the eighth grade for each school. There is usually a large attendance of elementary pupils in these schools, and frequently the pupils who are below the eighth grade are more numerous than those who are above it. With very few exceptions, Catholic girls' schools consist of both an elementary school and a high school.

The number of girls in our secondary schools is somewhat in excess of the number of boys; but, in both cases, the enrollment is far less than it ought normally to be. Catholic secondary schools, taken in the aggregate, have only about one-third of their due proportion of girls.¹ This means that about two-thirds of the Catholic girls who seek a secondary education go to public high schools and private non-Catholic academies. It is evident, therefore, that the existing facilities for the secondary education of Catholic girls will have to be greatly enlarged, if we would have them all educated under our own auspices.

FREE HIGH SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS

One of the principal reasons, apparently, why so many Catholic girls attend the public high school, rather than the excellent schools of secondary grade conducted by the Sisters, is, that the

¹ Cf. *op. cit.*; also pp. 3, 5 *supra*.

public high schools are free. A tuition charge of two to five dollars a month does not, at first sight, appear to involve much of a burden for parents, and such a charge is certainly not excessive, if one takes into account the high quality of the education that is given in the Sisters' schools. But, in most cases, the tuition charge is only one of several items of expense that the Catholic parent is called upon to meet, if he decides to send his daughter to a Catholic secondary school; and it is to be remembered that the parent may be paying for other children at the elementary school. If his daughter goes to the academy, she may want to take music, and perhaps other "extras," and the charge for such courses is comparatively high; in the public school, these extra courses are not generally to be had. Then too, text-books are often free in the public school, while they have to be paid for in the academy. Adding together the cost of tuition, "extras," and text-books, many a parent who has a desire to send his daughter to a Catholic academy finds that the sum amounts to more than he is able conveniently to pay.

The extent to which these motives have influence with parents may be inferred from the rapid growth of the new Catholic Girls' High School in Philadelphia. Opened only a few years ago, this institution, which is a free school, has now nearly a

thousand pupils, and the attendance is increasing so fast that the capacity of the school will soon be taxed to the full.¹ Yet Philadelphia contains many excellent Catholic academies that could accommodate more pupils than they have. There can be no doubt that a free Catholic high school for girls, in any large town or city, if organized in the same way as the Girls' High School in Philadelphia, would be equally successful. The result of the general establishment of such schools would be to attract to our own educational institutions a large proportion of the Catholic girls who are now taking their secondary education in the public schools.

But there are other motives than that of expense which lead Catholic girls to go to the public high schools. Girls who are looking forward to a career as teachers in the public schools find it advantageous to make their secondary studies in the public schools. In some places it is practically necessary for them to do this, to prevent unfair discrimination when admission is sought to the normal school. Recently, the circuit court in the City of St. Louis ruled against the constitutionality of such discrimination, in the case of a girl who applied for admission to the normal school without having previously attended the public

¹ Rt. Rev. P. R. McDevitt, *Ann. Rep.* for 1915.

schools.¹ It would be of great advantage to Catholic education, as well as a wholesome vindication of the principle of civic equality, if the attitude represented by this judicial decision were to prevail generally.

Another condition that must be considered, in attempting to account for the attendance of Catholic girls at the public high schools, is the

QUALITY OF THE INSTRUCTION

in girls' schools conducted by the religious sisterhoods. Broadly speaking, we may say that such schools are divided into two classes—those that aim at culture only or chiefly, and those that aim at both culture and utilitarian knowledge and acquirements. Schools of the former class offer, in addition to the regular high-school studies, graded courses in vocal and instrumental music, in drawing and painting, or other arts. They offer no courses in utilitarian subjects, or, if they do, these occupy a very subordinate position in the general curriculum. Schools of the latter class have, besides the regular high-school studies, a commercial course of two or three years, in which bookkeeping, shorthand and typewriting, or other practical subjects are taught, with the view of fitting girls for positions in active life. About

¹ *Cath. Ed. Rev.*, Nov., 1916, p. 357.

one-half of all our academies appear to aim chiefly at cultural education.

There can be no question about the high standing of these cultural schools, or of their great value to society. No finer tribute could be paid to their work, and no clearer evidence afforded of the high esteem in which it is held by the public, than the fact that so many non-Catholic parents send their daughters to them to be educated. Almost every academy of this class counts a considerable enrollment of non-Catholic pupils, drawn from families of the most respectable stations in life. The popularity of these institutions is due precisely to the kind of education they give. This education aims, above all, at developing the spiritual elements in womanly nature, and includes not only the ordinary school knowledge but also those finer ornamental accomplishments which contribute so much to make woman supreme in the home and in society. In a materialistic age such as ours, it is more than ever necessary to have schools that will stand primarily for this kind of education.

At the same time, it is not to be denied that many Catholic parents—and their number is rapidly augmenting—want their daughters to be trained along other lines, not so much from lack of appreciation of cultural education, as from force of circumstances. The classical colleges, some dec-

ades ago, were confronted by much the same conditions. It was conceded by many of the highest educational authorities that the training afforded by Latin and Greek was in itself superior to that afforded by the modern languages. Nevertheless, the modern languages have, to a great extent, replaced the classics in American colleges. The reason for the change was, that a large and constantly increasing body of students could not be induced to take the old classical course, and would not go to colleges that offered nothing else. Back of this practical exigency lay the more fundamental fact that the educational needs of society could no longer be satisfied by a single group of studies, however excellent.

For the same fundamental reason, the instruction that is given in academies that make culture their principal aim is no longer able to satisfy the needs of all Catholic girls. Besides these cultural schools, with their time-honored curriculum, other schools and curricula are imperatively needed.

WOMAN'S CHANGED POSITION

This need is an inevitable consequence of the changed position of woman in the world to-day. The traditional education for girls was based upon the view that woman's active interests were all to be centered in the home. Under present condi-

tions, however, very many women are compelled to seek employment outside of the home. Labor-saving machinery has swept industry from the home, and the woman who has to earn her own bread must go out and do so in competition with other women or with men.¹ Woman has become a new factor in the economic world, and the present prospect is that there are comparatively few occupations from which she is likely to be altogether excluded. In some departments of active life, it appears that men and women are destined to work side by side, on a footing of economic equality. In others, we see women gradually appropriating to themselves certain kinds of employment for which they are specially adapted by nature, and in which men either cannot or will not enter into competition with them.

In the public school system, women do all the teaching in the kindergarten, and almost all the teaching in the elementary schools. The same condition now obtains in the parish-school system. It is extremely probable that the few remaining men teachers in both public and parish schools will be replaced in time by teachers of the other sex. And it is to be noticed that in neither case was this movement foreseen or desired; it came about naturally, under the irresistible pressure of

¹ Shields, *The Education of our Girls*, p. 196 seq.

economic influences arising from changed general conditions.

In the realm of commerce and industry—I do not speak of occupations involving manual labor—the opportunities for women are constantly being widened. Women with a fair education are in demand to-day as secretaries, typewriters, book-keepers, clerks, commercial travelers, and the like. Positions of the kind command a salary that affords a comfortable, independent living. It is inevitable that Catholic young women should seek to take advantage of such opportunities, and their faith and education must be relied on to safeguard them from the dangers and temptations they may have to encounter.

The professions of law and medicine are likewise being opened to women, and year by year the list of successful women practitioners in these professions is increasing. So, too, in newspaper work, literature, the fine arts, and other professional occupations, women are daily demonstrating, in a practical way, their right to work alongside of men, without other limitation than that which may be placed by the measure of their ability to do work equally as good as that which may be done by men. The development of college and university education for women has resulted in throwing open to them, in the higher walks of life, a whole series

of occupations that were formerly regarded as being exclusively within the capacity of educated men. The graduate of a woman's college has no more difficulty in securing a position suitable to her attainments than the graduate of a college for men; indeed, she has usually less difficulty. This is due to the fact that while there is a great demand for young women of ability and thorough education, the supply is far from being equal to the demand.

FUTURE PROGRESS

In view of the changed position of woman in the world, and the ever-widening range of her opportunities for employment in active life, some important questions arise for those who are responsible for our institutions of secondary education for girls. It is plain that these schools must meet the needs of the age in which we live, if they are to win and hold the full patronage to which they are entitled. It is not less certain that, in order to do this, they must offer a sufficient variety of courses of instruction to enable girls to prepare themselves efficiently for the employments they will try to take up immediately upon their quitting school. Are our secondary schools for girls meeting the needs of the time in a way that is calculated to satisfy the Catholic public?

It may be said, I think, that very successful

efforts have been made by many of those who are in charge of our secondary schools for girls to adapt these institutions to the changed circumstances of woman's life and work. These efforts have been manifested in several ways. Many of the academies have established, side by side with the old regular academic curriculum, a commercial course of studies, or, at least, courses in shorthand, typewriting and bookkeeping, for the benefit of those who might be looking to positions along these lines. In some schools, excellent courses in domestic science have also been instituted. In many city academies, a feature of the regular work is the preparation of pupils for positions as teachers in public and parish schools. More attention, too, is being given to the needs of girls who are going on for a higher education. A notable movement in this direction has been inaugurated by the Sisters of Notre Dame, who have charge of Trinity College, all of whose secondary schools now offer courses to prepare for entrance to this college.

While much has thus been accomplished towards differentiating the work in the academies, it must be said that a great deal remains still to be done before we can rest satisfied with conditions. More Catholic secondary schools for girls are required, as has been shown; at the same time, the changes

and developments that have been going on in existing schools need to be carried much further, in accordance with definite and comprehensive plans.

In many places, Catholic girls are still left without adequate provision, in the way of secondary education, for their future employments. It would not be true to say that we have too many cultural schools for girls, but it is too often true that they are not properly distributed. There is evidently a serious defect in the adjustment of education to individual and social needs, where pupils who will have to go out and seek employment as soon as they graduate spend a large part of their time in school in the study of music and other artistic accomplishments, to the entire neglect of studies that would be of immediate help to them in securing good positions. Many academies that do not at present offer the commercial course, ought to do so, as a matter of service both to their pupils and to society. The same suggestion might well be made about the teaching of domestic science. In England, latitude is now given by the Board of Education for "an approved course in a combination of the following subjects: Needlework, cooking, laundry-work, housekeeping, and household hygiene for girls over fifteen years of age, to be substituted partially or wholly for science and

for mathematics other than arithmetic.”¹ This provision in the English educational system, for the training of girls in domestic science, might very profitably be adopted by the greater number of our secondary schools for girls. A course of this kind, along with a good commercial course, would give our schools a distinct advantage in this respect over the public high schools, without interfering in any way with the work of the ordinary curriculum.

The interests of girls who aspire to a collegiate education should also be carefully looked after in the academies. Such pupils usually follow the regular academic curriculum; but, in addition to this, they often have need of special attention and direction, or even special classes, in order to meet the requirements of the colleges they are to enter. The number of collegiate students in Catholic colleges for women is far below what it ought to be, and bears no comparison with the number in the colleges for young men. There is no sound reason why this disparity should continue to be as great as it is. Of late years, happily, there has been a marked improvement in the attendance at the colleges for women. With our comparatively large number of girls’ secondary schools—more numerous by far than our boys’ secondary schools—

¹ Stuart, *The Education of Catholic Girls*, p. 121.

it ought to be possible for these colleges to increase their enrollment several times over within the coming decade or two. To the attainment of this result, the academies may contribute much by encouraging pupils, in the practical ways that have been suggested, in their aspirations towards a higher scholastic career. Much might be accomplished in the same direction by the colleges themselves, if their higher superiors would make each of the academies conducted by the community a school preparatory to the main collegiate institution. These academies would still retain their character as finishing schools, for the great majority of their pupils. Catholic colleges for women occupy a position of special advantage in this respect, because the religious communities that conduct them are likewise in control of secondary schools. This is not the case, as a rule, with the teaching orders of men.

Several years ago it was suggested by the Advisory Board of the Catholic Educational Association, that toward the end of the grade course the aptitude of pupils and their probable future purpose or work in life should be the object of special attention on the part of those in charge of their education, so that suitable advice and direction might be given them in selecting further studies. The suggestion is specially applicable to

girls during their first year in the high school. With proper advice and direction, and a proper variety of courses of instruction, it will be possible, in most cases, to provide for the effective adjustment of the work of girls in the secondary school to their work and place in after life.

CHAPTER VIII

COLLEGE GROWTH AND TENDENCIES

INCREASING ENROLLMENT

IN the year 1916, a committee of the Catholic Educational Association, with the author as chairman, made an investigation of the attendance at Catholic male colleges and universities. The result showed that, in the 84 institutions containing students above the high school grades, there had been, in the aggregate, a very rapid increase in the number of collegiate students during the preceding decade. The increase was more rapid than that of collegiate students generally throughout the country during the same period.

The results obtained by the committee will be the better understood, if they are arranged alongside the returns for previous years. The following table shows, for various divisions of students, the numerical progress made during the past quarter of a century. The returns are respectively for the four scholastic years indicated in the column headings. In the last line is given the collegiate enrollment of all colleges and univer-

sities in the United States, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, and for the same divisions of students as are included in the first line of the table. The figures for the last line were derived from the Reports of the Commissioner of Education.

Growth of Catholic Colleges during Quarter Century.¹

	1889- 1890.	1899- 1900.	1906- 1907.	1915- 1916.
Collegiate enrollment ²	2,972	4,220	6,689	14,846
Undergraduates and graduates ³	2,402	3,213	4,666	8,667
Professional students ⁴	570	1,007	2,023	6,177
Engineering students.	17	25	55	974
Preparatory students.	4,945	6,476	12,462	16,288
Total college enrollment ⁵	8,487	11,703	21,174	32,256
Total collegiate enrollment in U. S. ⁶	60,259	101,483	129,416	190,278 ⁷

¹ *Report on the Attendance at Catholic Colleges and Universities in the U. S.* (Bull. of Cath. Ed. Assn. for Aug., 1916). Throughout the table duplicates are excluded.

² Including undergraduate, graduate, and professional students; excluding women and summer-school students.

³ Excluding professional students.

⁴ Theology, law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy.

⁵ Including "Collegiate Enrollment" above, preparatory, and regular summer-school students.

⁶ Non-Catholic and Catholic; including undergraduate and graduate students, professional students in universities and colleges, and students in schools of technology; exclusive of women. Special students, in music, art, etc., who are not enrolled in regular four-year courses, are not included, as it is not known how many of them are of collegiate grade. They are included in the Catholic collegiate enrollment. Cf. *Rep. Bur. Ed.* for 1914, II, p. 192; and *Ib.* for 1889-90, II, p. 1582 seq.

⁷ For the year 1914-15.

The investigation showed that nine of our universities now have over a thousand students, and

that several are well on the way to their second thousand. The preparatory-school enrollment, it will be noticed, has not kept pace with the collegiate enrollment, and the preparatory students are being gradually replaced by others of higher grade. The collegiate enrollment, comprising undergraduate, graduate, professional and engineering students, increased more than twofold during the past nine years. The most rapid growth has been in the department of engineering, in which courses are now offered by seventeen institutions. Next to the growth of the engineering department, comes that of the professional departments. Since the year 1890, the professional students have increased much more rapidly than the other collegiates, outside of engineering, but within the past few years this increase has been especially marked. This is due in great measure to the fact that, in some instances, independent schools of law, medicine, etc., were taken over by Catholic institutions, and became, at a stroke, fully organized university departments. But even with the omission of professional students, it may be observed that the collegiate enrollment was almost doubled during the past nine years, and that its growth was more rapid during this period than during the preceding seventeen years.

An interesting feature of this collegiate devel-

opment has been the establishment of summer schools for the members of the teaching sisterhoods. Six of the colleges now offer summer courses leading to regular academic degrees, while in several others the diocesan educational authorities conduct summer schools or teachers' institutes. It is quite likely that other large colleges that are favorably situated will join in this work, one of the most promising results of which is, to bring the colleges into closer touch with the parish schools and high schools.

The increase of collegiate students may be shown in a more striking way if the totals for collegiate enrollment given above are reduced to a percentage basis. The rate of growth of Catholic colleges and universities may thus be compared at a glance with the general rate of college and university growth throughout the United States. In the following table, for each of the three intervals of time given, the percentage rate of growth is shown, first for the entire interval, and then for each year on the average, the intervals not being of equal length.

This comparison shows that the rate of growth of our collegiate enrollment, which was much lower than the general rate for the United States in the decade between 1890-1900, rose high above the latter during the seven years between 1900-1907,

*Comparative Rate of Growth of Catholic Colleges and Universities—
Collegiate Enrollment.¹*

	1890-1900.		1900-1907.		1907-1916.	
	Per Cent Increase.	Average per Annum.	Per Cent Increase.	Average per Annum.	Per Cent Increase.	Average per Annum.
Catholic colleges and universities	42	4.2	58.5	8.4	121.9	13.5
All colleges and universities in U. S. .	68.4	6.8	27.5	3.9	47.2 ²	5.9 ²

¹ Including the same as "Collegiate enrollment" in preceding table.

² For the period 1907-15.

and higher still during the past nine years. A very significant fact is, that this rapid numerical increase commenced about the time the Catholic College Conference was organized, and began its work of bringing representatives of the colleges together annually. Much of the time of the meetings of the Conference, in its early years, was devoted to the discussion of ways and means of increasing the number of collegiate students.

The proportion of Catholic young men who go to non-Catholic colleges may also be ascertained, approximately, from the data in the first table. For this it is only necessary to compare the figures given there for collegiate enrollment with the respective population figures. This is done in the

following table, which shows, first, the number of collegiate students in Catholic colleges and universities to every million persons of the Catholic population; and next, the number of such students in *all* colleges and universities in the United States to every million persons of its population. The respective results are given for the same periods as above.

Number of Collegiate Students to Every 1,000,000 Persons of Respective Population, 1890-1916.

	1890	1900	1907	1916
Catholic collegiate enrollment ¹ . . .	359	417	511	896
Total collegiate enrollment in U. S. ¹ .	957	1,335	1,513	1,895 ²

¹ Including the same as "Collegiate enrollment" in first table.

² For 1915.

These figures show that, while in the year 1890 two-thirds of the young men who were due in our colleges were either not going to college at all or were going to non-Catholic institutions, by the year 1916 this adverse ratio had been reduced to about one-half. To be more exact, the collegiate students enrolled in our preparatory seminaries, which are, in reality, junior colleges, should also be counted in here. If this is done, the number 896 in the preceding table becomes 945.¹ As there is no reason for supposing that Catholics furnish

¹ *Report on Attendance at Cath. Colleges and Universities*, p. 9.

less than their normal proportion of college students, the conclusion would appear to be justified that about one-half of our young men who go to college attend non-Catholic institutions. This proportion is no larger than might be expected, in view of the special circumstances that so often influence young men in choosing a particular college. Proximity and expensiveness are, necessarily, determining factors in the case of very many. However, with the continuance of the progressive movements that are so evident at present in Catholic institutions of higher learning, it is not unlikely that a still larger proportion of our youth may be gradually drawn to them.

Including preparatory seminaries, the enrollment in Catholic colleges and universities in 1916 amounted to 18,767 students in high school grades and 16,775 students in higher grades—a total of 35,542.

COLLEGES FOR WOMEN

Conspicuous among recent Catholic educational movements has been the progress of higher education for women. Several Catholic colleges for women have existed for a long time. But the opening of Trinity College, at Washington, in 1901, with its high standards for entrance and graduation, gave a new impulse to the Catholic education of women. Since then, several of the larger acad-

emies have established collegiate departments; other institutions, which already had such departments, have strengthened and developed them. There is an evident disposition, too, to make a sharper distinction between the *academy* and the *college* for women, as well as between their respective graduates. It is likely that the traditional term "academy," which was long used indiscriminately to designate a Catholic school for women, whether of secondary or collegiate grade, will come to be applied only to institutions inferior to the college. Efforts to unite Catholic women's colleges in an association, for the furtherance of their common interests, successfully culminated in their admittance into the Catholic Educational Association at the Baltimore meeting, in 1916, as a special section of the College Department.¹

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

The progress of American higher education during the past half century has been marked by the transformation of many of the larger colleges into universities, the change consisting chiefly in the establishment of professional and postgraduate departments. Catholic colleges have had part in this movement, although only a few of them have

¹ In regard to the number of Catholic colleges for women and their student enrollment, cf. note on p. 3.

succeeded thus far in establishing well organized post-graduate departments, or in attracting post-graduate students in any considerable number. But the aggregate number of candidates for the higher academic degrees in non-Catholic universities in the United States is likewise relatively small, and it is not surprising that Catholic universities should find it difficult to attract such students. At places like Harvard, which has a considerable body of post-graduates, a large number of scholarships and fellowships are open to them. Of the one hundred or more post-graduates at the Catholic University, a large proportion hold scholarships. The Knights of Columbus Endowment at this latter institution provides for fifty scholarships, to be reserved exclusively for those doing post-graduate academic work.

These circumstances are mentioned merely to exemplify the causes that have hitherto prevented some of our universities from developing more fully their post-graduate departments. Many post-graduate students are unable to pay their own way, and they can usually obtain scholarships or their equivalent at endowed universities. Experience has shown that the offering of post-graduate courses, with competent teachers, will not of itself attract students, and that the further development of this feature of our institutions of

higher education will depend mainly upon the establishment of endowments.

As was noted above, the number of professional students in our colleges and universities has been increasing very rapidly. Thirty-nine institutions have at least one professional department. In many of these the professional students are confined to theology, and such institutions might, perhaps, best be classed as colleges with an attached theological seminary. But quite a number of institutions have schools of law, and several have also schools of medicine. The larger cities naturally afford the best conditions for the successful development of these departments. A law school may be made almost self-supporting, if the attendance is large and other circumstances are favorable. A medical school, however, cannot be made self-supporting even under the most favorable circumstances, if it is to be properly provided for in respect of teaching staff, equipment, and general appointments. An endowment of at least a million dollars would appear to be requisite for the proper support of a modern medical school, after provision has been made for buildings and equipment. These conditions render the establishment of a medical school extremely difficult if not impractical at most of our universities at present.

PREPARATORY DEPARTMENTS AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

It has been noted that the increase of preparatory students at Catholic colleges has not, in the aggregate, kept pace with the increase of collegiate students. Where the university development just referred to has been going on, the attendance of preparatory students has relatively fallen off. Our universities have evidently come to see that a preparatory department is no longer necessary for them, for they are drawing students in ever larger numbers, not only from Catholic high schools, but also from the public high schools. Trinity College has never had a preparatory department, and has never, apparently, felt the need of one. The same is true of the Catholic University, its undergraduate department having grown very rapidly by drawing students from secondary schools and smaller colleges. Several of our larger institutions are now removing their preparatory departments, and locating them at some distance from the college proper. It is likely that this will be done, sooner or later, by all universities and large colleges.

The removal of the preparatory departments, while it will accelerate the development of the larger institutions, will increase very notably the

differences already existing between them and the smaller colleges. Most of the latter will probably retain their preparatory departments, to offset the drift of their collegiate students to other institutions, especially after the Freshman or Sophomore Year. Comparatively few preparatory students stay at the same college until they obtain a college degree. Many of them do not intend more than a high-school education. Many, after completing the preparatory courses, begin collegiate work, but only with the view of preparing themselves, by a year or two of this work, for the upper collegiate years or professional courses in some university.

There are several Catholic colleges that do not carry students beyond the Sophomore Year. Their curriculum includes six years of study—four of secondary and two of collegiate grade. Such institutions are Junior Colleges, in the technical sense the term has come to bear. There are other colleges which, while offering a full collegiate curriculum, have very few students in the Junior and Senior Years, being unable to retain their students, in competition with the larger and stronger colleges around them. Would it not be better for these smaller institutions to drop the last two years of college work, and range themselves among the Junior Colleges? The Junior College has a field

of its own, and within this it need have little fear of competition. Such a change would be of advantage to the universities and larger colleges, by increasing their enrollment in the upper collegiate years, and it would greatly benefit the smaller colleges themselves. The energies which they are now devoting to the maintenance of the Junior and Senior Years, and which are so largely wasted, could then be turned to better account in strengthening their work. Improvement of the teaching and equipment could not fail to bring them an increase of students; and a condition of genuine prosperity and progress would thus replace the struggle for existence that characterizes the history of so many of the colleges of this class.

THE CURRICULUM—STANDARDIZATION

It has become more and more difficult for the small and struggling college to maintain a full collegiate curriculum up to the standard that obtains at reputable institutions of higher learning. The old uniform college curriculum is becoming a thing of the past. There are Catholic colleges which, almost from their very beginning, adopted the principle of allowing the student a certain choice in the studies to be pursued. However opposed to the elective system some Catholic educators

may have been in days gone by, and however firmly some of our colleges may still stand for the classical curriculum, it is, nevertheless, generally conceded that some option must be allowed the student in respect to courses and studies. Electives necessitate an increase of classes and teachers as well as equipment—a condition that severely handicaps the small college in attempting to carry on the work of the upper collegiate years. It is all-important for the Catholic college that the Catholic public should be convinced that its courses and equipment are fully as good and modern as those of non-Catholic colleges. Our stronger colleges have taken the obvious steps to attain this end, by adopting substantially the same standards that have come to obtain among the larger and better non-Catholic colleges and the state universities in regard to entrance and graduation requirements, teaching and equipment. Not only has this been done by individual colleges, but efforts have been made to have a uniform standard adopted by the College Department of the Catholic Educational Association.

These efforts have been fairly successful. The College Department has agreed that sixteen units should be required for entrance to college,¹ and one hundred and twenty-eight hours as a minimum

¹ Chicago Meeting, 1911.

for graduation.¹ In addition, the standing committee of the Department has recommended the adoption of the following provisions: That a college should have at least seven departments, with seven professors giving their entire time to college work; that the professors should have a college degree or its equivalent, and should instruct in that department for which they have had special preparation; that the college library should contain at least 5000 volumes; that the laboratory equipment should be sufficient to carry on work in physics, chemistry and biology, and should represent at least \$5000; that the student should be required to take at least sixteen, and ordinarily not more than twenty, hours of class work a week; and that no professor should be required to teach for more than sixteen hours a week.²

The next step was to secure the adoption by the College Department of some effective sanction for the practical observance of the above conditions by the colleges, or to provide for the classification of our colleges in such a way that those that meet the standard requirements would be readily distinguishable from those that do not meet them. At the Buffalo meeting of the Cath-

¹ New Orleans Meeting, 1913.

² Circular Letter of Pres. of College Dept., Feb. 15, 1915.

olic Educational Association, in 1917, a plan of this kind was agreed to, a committee being appointed to carry out the work of standardization and classification.¹

Standardization and classification of the colleges is imperatively needed, in fairness to both the stronger and the weaker colleges. Institutions that do not at present meet the moderate and reasonable requirements mentioned above, should either raise their standards to conform to these requirements, or assume the status of Junior Colleges. No one who has at heart the progress of higher education, and who is fully conversant with educational conditions within our country—not to mention the demands made by foreign universities—can fail to sympathize with this movement, the main object of which is, simply, to enable one to appraise college degrees at their true value. It will be far better for Catholic colleges to be standardized and classified by their own representatives, rather than by those who are unfamiliar with the Catholic college, and unable rightly to evaluate or appreciate some of its most essential features.

¹ Cf. Address of Rev. M. A. Schumacher, C.S.C., Pres. of the College Dept., *What Next?* in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, 1916, p. 91.

ENDOWMENT AND SUPPORT

One of the features of the Catholic college that outsiders find it difficult to understand is the manner of its support. As a rule, all successful non-Catholic colleges and universities are, to a great extent, maintained by funds derived either from the state or from individual benefactors. It is regarded as an axiom, outside the sphere of Catholic education, that a college or university cannot be self-supporting. On the other hand, Catholic colleges are generally self-supporting; only a few are even partially endowed, with the exception of the Catholic University.

To understand how this can be, it is necessary to know that all but eight of the eighty-four Catholic colleges and universities for men are conducted by religious orders. Most of the professors in these institutions are religious, and receive no salary, their services being entirely gratuitous. Now, professors' salaries are, as is well known, the chief source of expense in the non-Catholic college or university. Hence, the Catholic college, being largely free from this heavy outlay, is able to meet its general expenses from the tuition fees and other student revenue. Although the college faculty usually includes some lay or clerical salaried professors, the number of these, except

at a few institutions, is comparatively small. At the eight colleges conducted by the secular clergy—among these, the Catholic University is an endowed institution—all the professors are salaried; but many of them are clergymen, and the salaries of clerical professors are generally much less than those that laymen of equal ability would expect.

It would not be difficult to estimate the financial value of the gratuitously rendered services of the religious professors at any particular college. This has, in fact, been done in a number of instances. Some associations of colleges require, as a condition for admission, that an institution possess endowment funds to a certain amount. Catholic colleges have been able to satisfy this requirement by showing that they possess in these gratuitous services the equivalent of a permanent endowment, its value being shown by the sum of the salaries that the religious professors would, under other circumstances, be apt to receive.¹ Some of the States also require that the college shall possess a certain minimum endowment-fund, as a condition necessary to its granting degrees. Colleges that are doing real college work have nothing to fear from such restrictions, if they are fairly applied.

¹ Rev. H. S. Spalding, S.J., *Endowment of Men and Endowment of Money*, in *Ed. Rev.*, LII, p. 392.

At any of our larger colleges, if laymen were to replace the religious teachers and officials, the change would involve an increased salary expense ranging from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars a year. This would represent a capital, or endowment fund, between one and two million dollars. If the same change were made at all Catholic colleges, the increased expense would amount to at least three million dollars annually, which would represent endowment funds amounting to some sixty millions.

The fact that a Catholic college depends for its support mainly upon student fees, does not argue that its economic foundation is unstable or insecure. A notable falling off in the attendance would, it is true, cause serious financial difficulties; but the same condition would cause equal financial difficulties at any of the large and richly endowed institutions. Tuition fees make up a large part—rarely less than one-half—of the revenues of endowed colleges and universities; and a marked decrease in the amount of tuition fees at such institutions would necessarily give rise to a deficit, which could be met only by an immediate appeal to the generosity of friends and benefactors. Instances of this have been frequent enough in the history of American education. Catholic colleges are really better able to bear

such a financial strain than are endowed institutions, for they are better able to economize without substantial detriment to their regular work, and in case of urgent need they can rely, to some extent, upon the general resources of their respective religious orders.

Still, although most of our colleges have received little or no aid from the outside thus far in the form of gifts or endowments, it need scarcely be said that such benefactions are greatly to be desired. The introduction of the elective system, even to a limited extent, has multiplied classes and added to the general expense. University development has increased the number of lay professors at many institutions, besides making expensive demands in the way of buildings and equipment. More lay professors will be needed in the future, and it will also be necessary to increase their salaries, which are now far below the salaries of those occupying corresponding positions in endowed institutions. The time appears to have arrived when gifts and endowments are absolutely necessary to our colleges and universities, if they are to continue along the ways of progress upon which they have entered.

Fortunately, signs are not wanting that the Catholic public is beginning to appreciate properly these conditions. The success of the Catholic

University in raising a large endowment fund, shows that wealthy Catholics may be counted on to aid in the upbuilding of worthy institutions of the higher learning. Creighton University stands as a monument to a noble Catholic philanthropist. In the year 1916, Marquette University collected half a million dollars within a few weeks, largely from the citizens of Milwaukee, for the development of the work of its departments. These and other notable benefactions that might be mentioned show that a new period in the development of Catholic higher education has begun, a period that is to be characterized by a more successful appeal to the generosity of the Catholic public, and especially of Catholic men of wealth. Our colleges will still have to depend upon the religious orders, and to some extent upon those secular clergymen who, out of love for the cause of Christian education, are content with a salary that is barely sufficient for their individual support. But endowments will provide for more lay professors, and at better salaries than the colleges can now afford to pay them; scholarships and fellowships will afford more and better opportunities for poor boys and promising young teachers of limited means; while the erection of libraries, laboratories, dormitories and other buildings by generous-minded men and women of wealth will

relieve our colleges and universities of one of their heaviest financial burdens, and enable them to devote their energies more exclusively to the perfecting of their work in the intellectual and spiritual orders.

FREEDOM OF TEACHING

Of the seventy-six Catholic colleges which are conducted by the religious orders, twenty-five belong to the Jesuits, fourteen to the Benedictines, and six to the Christian Brothers. Professors who are religious are removable at the will of their superiors, and their teaching is, therefore, completely under the control of the religious authorities. From this, however, it is not to be inferred that a religious professor is not allowed a reasonable freedom in his work. It is recognized that there must be a certain unity of teaching in regard to subjects like theology and philosophy; as to the rest, religious professors enjoy as much freedom as do professors in American colleges generally. The unity of teaching that obtains in Catholic colleges and universities does not forbid research and progress even in theology and philosophy; it is rather a guarantee that progress, however gradual, will be sure and permanent; and its influence upon the mind of the Catholic student must be correspondingly wholesome. The body of sound

religious, philosophical and moral principles he holds forms a correlating center for all his other knowledge; and he is conscious that these principles are taught by Catholic professors everywhere throughout the world to-day, as they have been through all the past ages.¹

¹ Cf. Chapter III, discussion of "Correlation."

CHAPTER IX

INNER COLLEGE PROBLEMS

DISCIPLINE

It was shown in the preceding Chapter that great changes have taken place in many Catholic colleges. Along with the changes referred to, however, which relate chiefly to the outer form and organization of the college, other developments have been going on, involving problems more fundamental in character, which relate to the inner life and work of the college. These problems may conveniently be considered under the heads of discipline, religion, and teaching.¹

The general features of student life and the general disciplinary regulations in the Catholic college to-day, especially the boarding college, are very different from what they were a generation or so ago. Our colleges formerly were, to a great extent, secluded from the world. Seldom, and then only for a good reason, was a student allowed to go even to the neighboring town. Athletic games and

¹The substance of this Chapter was published in the *Catholic World* for Jan., 1917.

contests, while never lacking, were restricted to the college and to those who lived at the college. The general aim was to render the college self-sufficient, so that the life, the work, the recreations and the interests of the students would be centered and so far as possible confined within its bounds. Besides seclusion from the world, simplicity and uniformity were aimed at in the daily regimen. The students sat at table in a common dining-room, studied together in the study halls, slept in large dormitory-rooms that were absolutely alike as regards conveniences, and made use of common wash-rooms, trunk-rooms and recreation "yards"; and all students, as a rule, whether young or old, rich or poor, fell under this severely democratic regime. The system had its advantages, and they were many and clear. It probably had its disadvantages, too, whatever may have been their relative importance.

But this traditional Catholic college system, which goes back to the Middle Ages, and perhaps much farther, is no more. For many years, changes have been going on. One cause of change was the establishment of dormitories with private rooms. Previously, a few of the older students here and there may have been allowed to live in private rooms; but when, in the year 1888, Sorin Hall was erected at Notre Dame University, for

the express purpose of providing private rooms for a large body of students, a break was made with the traditional discipline. Sorin Hall, in spite of temporary difficulties, proved to be a success, and other private-room dormitories followed in time at Notre Dame as well as at other institutions. The private room was fatal to both the theory and the practice of uniform college life and discipline. It did away, for its occupant, with the common sleeping-room and study hall, the wash-room, trunk-room, and the "yard," and a special code of disciplinary regulations had to be formulated for the "roomers." Many of the changes involved were feared and opposed by the more conservative members of college faculties; but the room system proved to be extremely popular with the students, and brought an increase in the college enrollment. Once it was given a fair trial, it became forever impossible to go back to the old system. As private-room life was more expensive, a considerable body of students in each institution continued to live and work in the common rooms under the old discipline, now become less strict; but the number of these has been relatively decreasing. The demand is ever for more rooms, and it is evidently only a question of time until all the larger boys at Catholic colleges will be living in private rooms. Even the smaller colleges have joined in

this movement. In many institutions, more than one-half of the student body is now housed in private-room dormitories.

After private rooms, intercollegiate athletics has been, perhaps, the most important factor in the transformation that has been effected in the life and discipline of the Catholic college. Intercollegiate athletics necessarily brought the college into closer touch with the outer world. The college athletes went out to play, accompanied at times by crowds of other students; and crowds from outside, made up of the students and alumni of rival colleges and other athletic enthusiasts, came in to witness games on the college campus. Money for athletic expenses had to be raised from business men of the neighboring town or city, and the students were naturally expected to patronize them in return. The press, too, both local and metropolitan, found that athletic events at the college made interesting news-matter for its sporting pages, and its sporting pages, in turn, helped to popularize the daily newspaper at the college. Many other circumstances of like import might be mentioned.

Another important influence in the same general direction has been the increasing tendency towards luxury and extravagance in American life. In a hundred little ways this spirit has crept into the

college from the great world outside, and has helped to break down the old-time simplicity and plainness of college life as well as its seclusion from the world. It is unnecessary to cite evidence of this. Suffice it to say that the social inequalities brought about by wealth have their reflection, to some extent, in student life in the Catholic college, as they have in all other American colleges.

It is not for the purpose of fault-finding that these changes in the life and discipline of the Catholic college are adverted to. They were, in a certain measure, inevitable. Nevertheless, they involve some serious problems for the college, and these problems have not as yet been completely solved. How far are such changes to be allowed to go? In the matter of intercollegiate athletics, for instance, is it safe for Catholic colleges to adopt the same attitude as those non-Catholic institutions that are known to be most liberal in this respect? Can the absence of groups of students from the college, with their neglect of classes and study, during athletic trips of a week or several days at a time, be a wholesome thing for the absentees, whatever may be the effect upon the general body of students?

It is, indeed, a serious question as to how far changes and relaxations in the general discipline of the Catholic college may be allowed, in view of

the responsibility of the college for the morals of its students. Certainly, our colleges can never accept the theory of discipline which the president of a large non-Catholic college in the East proclaimed—to require no more from his students, in matters of conduct, than is required by the ordinary police jurisdiction. The inculcation of Christian morality is an inalienable religious duty of the Catholic parent. When the boy goes to college, the parent's responsibility is transferred to the president of the college, but only temporarily and conditionally. Should the college fail in its duty in this respect, the parent would be bound in conscience to repair the defect, which could only mean, practically, to send the boy somewhere else. Such is the unquestioned teaching of Catholic theology.)

The responsibility of the college for the moral education of the student necessarily involves the obligation of control and supervision in matters of conduct. But how much control and supervision should there be? This is not an easy question to decide. Undoubtedly, college discipline must take into account changed conditions of life in the world outside and the spirit of the age. This much may be safely said, however, that our general policy in regard to discipline ought to be based upon our own educational traditions, rather than upon mere

expediency or the example of non-Catholic institutions. The cardinal principle of our traditional discipline has been the concentration of all the student's active interests at the college, in books and study, in necessary duties and wholesome recreations. It may not, perhaps, be possible to accomplish this as fully and effectively to-day as formerly, but the principle itself is sound, and is, in fact, only a practical expression of the fundamental purpose of the college. This principle ought, therefore, to be maintained as a general norm in the regulation of discipline, whatever modifications of particular disciplinary rules and customs it may be thought necessary or wise to introduce.

RELIGION

The most effective agency that can be invoked for the maintenance of sound Catholic discipline in the college is religion. Religion has always been relied on to keep students in the path of duty; in the future, it will have to be relied on more than ever. The traditional disciplinary restraints have been largely outworn, and the student is now thrown more upon his honor, which must mean—in the Catholic college at least—his conscience. Hence, with the enlargement of individual liberty at the college, it became necessary that there should be a corresponding enlargement, or at least

realignment, of the existing religious influences, in the life of the individual student as well as in the college as a whole. For this the new discipline offered both the opportunity and the need.

Has this been fully realized by college authorities? Have religious influences been quickened, and brought into closer touch with the needs or aspirations of the individual student? Has religion maintained her place of primacy among the educative forces at work to form mind and character? It is easier to ask such questions than to answer them. If they are raised here, it is chiefly for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity of maintaining religion in her traditional place of first importance in the work of the Catholic college.

It may be—as we hear it said—that common chapel services are not as frequent at many of the colleges as they used to be, outside of Sundays and holy-days; that the annual retreat is not made as much of, in outward observance, as it formerly was; and that the religious societies elicit comparatively less interest than they once did. But such changes would not, of themselves, necessarily indicate any real lessening of religious life or influences. On the other hand, it is certain that the appeal for frequent and daily communion has nowhere had a more generous response than in the colleges. The students who daily throng

the altar rail in the college chapels are a living proof that religion has lost nothing of its power to sway the minds and hearts of our young men. The great question is, are we doing our utmost to increase its power and efficacy? Are we planning and striving in the earnest, anxious way we plan and strive for improved curriculum and class-work, to enlarge the place of religion in the college life as a whole and in the life of each individual student?

The most important office in the college is, in some respects, that of the prefect of religion. The priest who is assigned to this position should be not only distinguished by his piety and zeal, but also possessed of those natural qualities of heart which attract the young and invite their confidence. He need not be a learned man. Like the prefect of studies, the prefect of religion should be free to devote himself entirely to the duties of his office. He has a general responsibility for the spiritual welfare of hundreds of young men, who are at the very turning point of their moral lives; and, in addition to his daily spiritual ministrations and conferences, and the regular chapel services, he has many other things to look after, such as the work of the religious societies and those special exercises and devotions that are needed from time to time to quicken the religious life of the

college student. To assign such an office to a busy teacher, in the expectation that, somehow, his zeal will enable him to look after the all-important interests of religion during his scanty free hours, is to go far towards relegating religion to an inferior place in the life and work of the institution.

Much of the time and attention of the prefect of religion might profitably be devoted to the care of priestly and religious vocations. In every Catholic college there are a certain number of students whose piety and fervor, if rightly directed, will lead them to the priestly or religious life. Our colleges and universities have noble religious traditions to sustain. They have had part in the training of many of the greatest priests of the Church—scholastic philosophers and theologians, founders of religious orders and reformers, contemplatives and missionaries. From them have come most of the teachers who are carrying on the work of Christianity to-day in our institutions of higher education, as well as many of the priests who are engaged in spreading the Christian Faith in pagan lands. More than ever before, the development of such vocations in the college is important at the present time. In missionary work, especially, a great opportunity has arisen for the American Catholic college. American priests are needed

everywhere throughout the mission world, and our colleges are called upon, by their own traditions no less than by the exigencies of the general situation, to take the lead in meeting this demand.

College students who are looking towards the priesthood form the finest material for the missionary vocation. Their college training is calculated to develop not only high intellectual ability, but also the most generous religious sympathies; and—unlike students in the diocesan seminaries—they are generally free to devote themselves to religious work in any part of the world. It would be easy to establish a missionary society at every Catholic college. The purpose of such a society would be, to arouse interest in the missions, both home and foreign, to develop missionary vocations, and to collect material means for the work. The dues would need to be no more than a mere trifle, say, five or ten cents a month; but considerable money might be raised at times in other ways. Certain college organizations, such as the glee club, might be asked once in a while to devote the proceeds of a benefit entertainment to the cause, for many students besides those expecting to enter the sacred ministry would take an interest in such a society. Catholic colleges in France have long contributed regularly to the collections of the Society for the Propagation of the

Faith, and their students have much less pocket money than our students. But the amount of money collected would not matter so much; the main object would be, to call attention to the missions and their needs and to develop the spirit of generosity and self-sacrifice. The establishment of such societies at the colleges would naturally lead to some kind of a general association of the local organizations, with an annual convention, where there would be papers and discussions on the **missions**, and addresses by priests and bishops having experience of real missionary life. Such a movement could not fail to produce most important results in furtherance of Catholic missionary activity throughout the world, while, at the same time, it would have a most wholesome religious influence upon the colleges themselves.

There are other features of religious work in the colleges that call for development. I shall mention only one of these—the encouragement of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors. The Catholic total abstinence society should be regarded as a religious society, and it should be under the direction of the prefect of religion. The form of pledge commonly employed involves a religious act, the motive proposed being the sublime self-sacrifice of Christ. The strength of such an organization lies, not in numbers, but in its religious

spirit, in the examples it furnishes of noble Christian self-restraint, and in its assured support and encouragement by the college authorities. There are plenty of students in every Catholic college who are willing to join such a society.

There should be a total abstinence society in every college. A great moral movement, directed against intoxicating liquor and the liquor interests, is stirring the country. The agitation may not be free from excesses; but it evidences the concern of vast numbers of thinking men and women about the undoubtable dangers of drink, especially to the young. Are these dangers ever greater than they are in the life of the college student? Should not every legitimate means be employed, in order to reinforce the rule of conduct which the college seeks to inculcate in this respect? For, total abstinence is one of the traditional rules of American Catholic colleges. How much more effective will be this rule, especially under the present system of enlarged personal freedom, if the principle of religious self-sacrifice is given prominence among the practical motives for its observance! This is what a religious total abstinence society does. The membership may be small or it may be great; but, in either case, such a society represents a clear moral asset for the college, in its supreme work of promoting high-minded Christian life.

THE TEACHER

Some of the most vital problems involved in the development of the Catholic college or university at the present time have to do with the teacher. As most of our institutions of higher education are conducted by religious orders, we may confine our attention here to teachers who are religious.

In the preparation of the young religious for his work in the college, methods and standards that are entirely different from those that once obtained appear to be now requisite. Formerly, a professor was called upon to teach branches of knowledge that have little or no direct relation to each other. He might have charge of all the classes that went to make up a year of the classical course. His daily work might thus have to do with subjects as diverse as history and mathematics, or Greek and chemistry. This system still obtains in some places, especially in the preparatory department. It possesses certain advantages, and there could be little objection to it if the teaching of each branch could be made thorough. Whatever may be thought, however, of the employment of this system in the preparatory department, its successful employment in the college proper has become increasingly difficult, if not practically impossible.

It has never been questioned that, in college work at least, the teacher must have acquired a thorough mastery of whatever he teaches, if he is to achieve the highest success. But to master any important branch of knowledge nowadays, it is necessary to make a life study of it. This applies even to the dead languages, Latin and Greek. The fruits of scholarly research have become so abundant that it is ordinarily impossible for one who spreads his attention over several fields of knowledge to become thoroughly acquainted with any one of them. Hence, the college teacher must be a specialist, which means that he must have made a thorough, comprehensive study of some one branch of knowledge, as well as some study of the cognate branches. Only through such a preparation can he bring to his classes a scholarship that will satisfy his students, and an enthusiasm that may enkindle in them a living interest in the work. The training of specialists is a function of the university, and only in the university, as a rule, can the college teacher be properly prepared for his work. The equivalent of university training may, of course, be furnished by the special systems of post-graduate instruction that obtain in certain religious orders for the preparation of their teachers, in so far as accepted university methods and standards are employed.

Catholic colleges possess a most important advantage in respect to their teachers. Every year, numbers of the brightest and best students in our schools and colleges join the religious orders, and devote their lives to college work. Many of these young men are capable of attaining to the highest scholarship, and need only to be properly educated, to be the equal of the best professors in the great endowed or state universities. And once they are educated, whatever may be the expense involved, their scholarship is entirely at the service of the institution or order to which they belong, and this for the term of their lives. In non-Catholic colleges and universities the most talented students may be picked out and educated for professorships in their *alma mater*; but they may afterwards be attracted to other institutions, by the offer of a higher salary or some other advantage, just when their services have become of special value.

The best investment that the college or religious order can make, to further its educational aims, is the expenditure involved in the thorough training of those young religious who are destined to be professors. Every college teacher should have had a university training. A college degree can no longer be regarded as sufficient evidence that the recipient is competent to teach subjects included

in the college curriculum; nor can the study of philosophy and theology *in* Latin, after the college work in the classics, be regarded as sufficient preparation even for the teacher of Latin. Such views were common enough formerly, and some excuse for them could be found in the pioneer condition of many of the colleges. But to-day they are wholly untenable, in view of the generally accepted standards. This is not less true of teaching in colleges for women than of teaching in colleges and universities for men.

The assertion that every college teacher should have had a university training, does not necessarily mean that every college teacher should have received a *full* university education, or should have a university degree. This would be to demand the impossible. Various circumstances may prevent the completion of university work, especially ill health. But every one destined to teach in a college should pass at least a year or two at a university, in order to acquire, in addition to an advanced knowledge of his specialty, a knowledge of the methods of critical study and original research. A year or two thus spent will open the way to further advanced study, and make it possible for him, with the aid of time and books, to attain to riper scholarship by himself. So far as possible, however, a complete university training

should be given to all who are destined for college teaching.

But the work at the university is not all. Even after this has been completed, the institution or order to which the young religious belongs has something more to do, before its task of preparing him for his life work can be properly regarded as ended. It is of the essence of the training afforded by the modern university that the student should regard his work there as but his initiation in scholarship; and he will be untrue to the university ideal if he is not led on, by what he has already done, to further and more mature research work. For this, time and opportunity are requisite. Many a young teacher, fresh from the university, and eager to continue his studies, finds himself so heavily burdened by classes that he can scarcely get time to prepare sufficiently for each class. Administration work, assigned to young teachers, is no less fatal to intellectual growth. Prefecting, which is indispensable in the Catholic college, is another duty that is apt to interfere seriously with scholarly ambition.

No doubt, it is exceedingly difficult if not impossible, under present conditions, for college authorities to avoid the assignment of such duties to those who have been trained for the work of teaching. However, conditions will be brought

about in time, it may be hoped, which will render such exemption possible, and allow teachers more time for private study and research. An increase of priestly and religious vocations, which was shown above to be so desirable for other reasons, would add more men to the college faculties, and thus diminish the amount of class work assigned to each member. It would also furnish a larger supply of men with special capacity for administrative work. Furthermore, some of the students who are destined for the sacred ministry are capable of making excellent prefects, and, with a larger number of such students to select from, teachers might be entirely relieved of prefecting by the institution of a system of student prefects or proctors. These possibilities show how intimately related the problem of the intellectual development of the college is with the even more important problem of its religious development.

One of the best means of inducing young teachers to continue their advanced studies is to surround them with an atmosphere of scholarship. Even those who are heavily burdened by classes can do something in the way of advanced study, if they have a real desire to do so, or are urged on by the example of others. At every college there are a few men whose passionate devotion to knowledge is proof against almost any amount of time-

consuming duties. Such men, especially, should be allowed all the opportunities that can be given them for private study. Their scholarly achievements, by their influence upon the other members of the faculty and the students, will be worth far more to the institution than direct teaching. It is through such men that an atmosphere of intellectuality is created, and lasting traditions of scholarship are established, within an institution. A few great scholars are enough to make the academic reputation of any college or university.

CHAPTER X

SEMINARIES

DIOCESAN AND RELIGIOUS SEMINARIES

ECCLESIASTICAL seminaries have always been an object of special concern to bishops and religious superiors in the United States, and in no other department of Catholic educational work has greater progress been effected.¹ Following the legislation of the Council of Trent, which laid the foundations of the modern seminary system, our plenary and provincial councils have labored to perfect the American seminary, and to adjust its work to the special conditions of clerical life in the New World. By the decrees of Pius X higher standards were prescribed for religious establishments in respect to entrance into the seminary and ordination.

Catholic seminaries in the United States may be divided into two classes, the secular and the religious. The former are destined for the training of the secular or diocesan clergy; the latter, for

¹ The greater part of this chapter appeared in the *Amer. Eccl. Review* for Nov., 1916.

the training of the clergy of the various religious orders. Secular seminaries are usually conducted by diocesan priests, under the direction of the Ordinary, although several of them are in charge of religious congregations. The religious seminaries are conducted by members of the religious bodies to which such institutions belong. If an order has several provinces, each province usually has its seminary; and in those orders in which the individual houses are independent, each of the larger establishments may have its own seminary. The diocesan seminaries, although greatly outnumbered by those of the religious orders, have, in the aggregate, almost twice as many students as the latter. St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, the largest and oldest of the diocesan seminaries, is conducted by the Sulpicians, and has over three hundred students. The largest religious seminary, and also the oldest, is the Jesuit establishment at Woodstock, Md., with nearly two hundred students.¹

PREPARATORY SEMINARIES

Of late years, there has been a great increase in the number of preparatory seminaries, both diocesan and religious. Cathedral colleges have been

¹ For the number of seminaries, professors, and students, see p. 172.

established in New York, Chicago, and several other cities. The preparatory seminaries, whatever title they may bear, are classical colleges, and their curriculum, so far as it goes, does not differ substantially from the classical curriculum of the ordinary college or university. The chief difference between the preparatory seminary and the regular college lies in the distinctly ecclesiastical purpose of the former, which, as a rule, admits only those who intend to enter the sacred ministry. The curriculum of the preparatory seminary usually covers four years of high-school work and the two lower years of the college classical course.

In establishing preparatory seminaries, where the formation of candidates for the sacred ministry may be begun at the age of twelve to fourteen, the Church in America is but carrying out one of the most important educational decrees of the Council of Trent.¹ Conditions in this country long hampered the development of this feature of the seminary system, although a few of our preparatory seminaries date from a very early period.² Doubtless, the future will witness a further increase in the number of these institutions, which are so well

¹ Cf. Session XXIII, c. 18; Cf. Conc. Balt. Plen., III, n. 153.

² Burns, *Estab. of Cath. Sch. Sys. in U. S.*, p. 168 seq.

calculated to develop vocations to the priesthood, and to foster the true ecclesiastical spirit.

These two aims of the preparatory seminary are of special importance for the religious orders. Coming less in contact with the people than the

Seminaries ¹

	Seminaries.	Professors.	Students.
Diocesan.....	21	178	2282
Religious.....	46 ²	291	1394
Total.....	67	469	3676

Preparatory Seminaries ¹

Diocesan.....	11	141	1727 ³
Religious.....	23 ⁴	186	1734
Total.....	34	327	3461

¹ These figures are taken from the *Catholic Directory* for 1915.

² Representing 21 religious orders.

³ Not including the preparatory seminary at Grand Rapids, Mich.

⁴ Representing 16 religious orders. A number of these institutions receive students preparing for diocesan seminaries.

diocesan clergy, the former are at a certain disadvantage in securing vocations. It might seem that this disadvantage would be offset by the fact that they have charge of most of the colleges. But the colleges, if we except those conducted by the Jesuits, do not supply vocations enough for the respective novitiates, and most of the religious orders

have, therefore, found it necessary to establish preparatory seminaries. Some of the larger orders have two, and several of them have three, preparatory seminaries.

Some of the smaller colleges are practically preparatory seminaries, as most of their students are candidates for the priesthood. However, when such institutions are listed as regular colleges, they are not included in the preceding table, which shows the number of seminaries and preparatory seminaries, both diocesan and religious, together with the number of their professors and students, in the United States in the year 1915.

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE

Religious seminaries are governed according to the discipline and spirit of their respective orders; professors and students, being members of the same religious family, are thrown together a great deal, outside of what might be called their professional relations. Much the same family spirit prevails in the diocesan seminaries. The importance of this feature of seminary life, for the formation of priestly and religious character, needs no emphasis. In the seminary, as in the college, the professors share in the government of the institution, as regards classes and instruction. The discipline is in charge of the rector and his assistants.

The specific aim of seminary discipline is the thorough spiritual formation of the candidate for the priesthood, and to this end, besides the reception of the Sacraments, there are appropriate ascetical exercises for the seminarian—daily meditation and prayer, daily spiritual reading or instruction, spiritual direction, special devotions, the practice of silence at certain times, and other acts of mortification and virtue. It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the work of the seminary along these lines, for it is substantially the same in all well-regulated institutions, and is grounded upon the laws and traditions of the Church.¹

LENGTH OF THE CURRICULUM

The entrance requirements for admission to seminaries in the United States were prescribed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and involve the completion of the work of the preparatory seminary. This, as has been noted, covers four years of high school work and the two lower years of the college. Unfortunately, it is often found difficult to adhere to this standard in practice, especially in the case of those who begin their

¹ Cf. Rev. P. Dissez, S.S., *On the Formation in Seminaries of Candidates to the Holy Priesthood*; and Rev. W. F. Likly, C.M., *Aim and Method of Spiritual Training in the Seminary* (*Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, 1906).

preparatory studies rather late in life, and yet afford evidence of a true vocation to the priesthood. Such vocations are not infrequent.¹

The length of the curriculum of the diocesan seminary was definitely fixed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore: "In all seminaries the course of study shall embrace not fewer than six years, two of which shall be devoted to the study of philosophy and four to that of theology."² In the recent legislation enacted at Rome for seminaries of religious orders throughout the world, practically the same length of time was prescribed. Thus, in the decree "*Auctis Admodum*," Nov. 4, 1893, it was declared that the study of theology should occupy four full years, after the completion of the regular curriculum of "other studies." These "other studies" were defined by the Congregation for Religious in the "*Declarationes circa Articulum Sextum Decreti 'Auctis Admodum,'*" dated Sept. 7, 1909:

The theological student does not fulfill the legal requirements if he has not previously gone through a full course of philosophical studies or studies of the lyceum; the same

¹ Cf. Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, S.S., *The Intellectual Requirements for Entrance into the Seminary*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, VI, p. 449 seq.; also, Secretary's Report on same in *ib.* p. 447.

² Conc. Plen. Balt., III, n. 166.

is true of the philosophical student, if he has not completed the regular curriculum of humanities or studies of the gymnasium; nor will the student of humanities be qualified legally if he has not had a primary education. Therefore, in order to pass legitimately from the primary schools to the gymnasium, from the gymnasium to the lyceum, and from the lyceum to the theological seminary, certificates are required which testify to successful tests or examinations.¹

In testimonial letters for the ordination of religious, superiors are bound to testify to the completion of the studies of the theological seminary, and the years of study covered by this certificate must be full academic years. Doubling up or shortening of courses is forbidden, and vacation study is not to count.

Several questions suggest themselves in regard to the meaning and scope of this legislation. First of all, how would the academic standards that are enjoined be formulated in terms of our American educational system? The "gymnasium" and the "lyceum" do not exist among us. We may know something of the German gymnasium and the French lycée, but Americans are, with few exceptions, unfamiliar with the Italian system of education. At the end of this Chapter, there will be found a diagram, showing in detail the relations between the American and the Italian educational

¹ Cf. *Amer. Eccl. Rev.*, Vol. 41, 729 seq.

systems. It will suffice, for our present purpose, to outline briefly these relations.

Let it be supposed that an Italian boy and an American boy commence primary school work at the beginning of their seventh year. After five years of study, or at the beginning of his twelfth year, the Italian boy passes into the gymnasium, where he takes up the study of Latin. Only three years later, or at the age of fifteen, does the American boy enter the high school and take up Latin. The latter is thus three years behind the former, in beginning Latin and other secondary studies. This is the most striking feature of the differences between the two systems, so far as we are now concerned. After spending five years in the gymnasium, the Italian boy begins the three-year course of the lyceum or of the philosophical department of the seminary. The graduate of the lyceum, if he is to be a priest, is then expected to devote a year to "propedeutics," or special preparation for theology. He would thus finish the four years' course of theology at the end of his twenty-fourth year. The American seminarian, after passing through high school and college, is generally obliged, if he goes to a diocesan seminary, to spend a year in the philosophical department of the seminary in preparing for theology, which he would, therefore, finish only at the end of his

twenty-seventh year. If he were to attend a preparatory seminary instead of a college, he would save this extra year of preparation for theology. It may be noted that the obligation of military service usually postpones ordination in Italy for a year.

The Italian boy studies Latin during the five years of the gymnasium and the three years that follow in the lyceum, making eight years of Latin in all; the American boy studies Latin during seven or eight years—four in the high school and three or four in the college, but, in the aggregate, he has not as many class hours in Latin as the former has. On the other hand, the American student devotes more time to Greek than does the Italian. In Italy, Greek is begun in the fourth year of the gymnasium, and is continued through the lyceum and the year of "propedeutics" (if the latter is taken). This makes five or six years of Greek in all. The American student usually begins Greek in the first or second year of the high school, and continues it until towards the end of the college course, thus giving from six to eight years to this study. As for philosophy, it is begun by the Italian student in the first year of the lyceum, at the age of seventeen, and continued for three or four years, while in the American college philosophy is usually taken during the three upper years

of the college course. In Italian state lyceums, only two hours a week are allotted to philosophy; but students who are to go to a seminary are expected to have two or three hours a week more in philosophy during their lyceum course; and besides this, five hours a week are to be devoted to philosophy during the year of "propedeutics." On the whole, much more time is given to the study of philosophy in Italy than here.¹

Suppose, now, that a candidate for a religious order in this country is considerably above the ordinary age when he begins secondary studies—and this, as has been said, is very often the case; may the curriculum in high school or college be lawfully abbreviated in his behalf? This question does not appear to be definitely decided by the "*Declarationes*." As quoted above, the Decree evidently implies that the entire pre-theological course of studies in other countries—including elementary branches, humanities and philosophy—will be practically equivalent to the entire pre-theological course in Italy. But this does not necessarily mean that the one must cover exactly the same length of time as the other. As a matter of fact, this period is three years longer here than it is in Italy, because we give three years more to the elementary branches.

¹ See diagram at the end of Chapter.

Again, many of our preparatory seminaries devote but six years to the classics, after which the student passes to the philosophical department of the seminary, where there is no formal study of either Latin or Greek. Is this in accordance with the requirements of the new law? or, is it requisite that Latin be studied for eight years, as in Italy? The "*Declarationes*" does not explicitly prescribe eight years' study of Latin, nor does such an obligation appear to be necessarily implied. The Decree clearly requires that the candidate for the priesthood complete the *entire regular curriculum*. But in this country we have two regular classical curricula, so far as Latin is concerned. The classical curriculum of the preparatory seminaries requires but six years of Latin, while that of the colleges requires seven or eight years of Latin. There is good reason for maintaining that, as regards Latin at least, the six years' curriculum is fully equivalent to the eight years' curriculum, because of the special attention given to the study of this language during the shorter period.

There are two changes that might be made in our educational system, in order to smooth the way that leads to the seminary. The first would be, to increase the amount of time devoted to Latin during the earlier years of its study, with a corresponding diminution of the time given to it

later on. The Italian boy, even in the government schools, gives seven class hours a week to Latin during the first three years of the gymnasium, and only three hours a week to it in the lyceum. This arrangement would allow more time in our colleges for the all-important study of philosophy. The change could easily be made by giving an extra Latin class, during the earlier preparatory years, to boys who expect to enter the seminary.

Another helpful change would be, the introduction of Latin into the seventh or even the sixth grade of the parish schools. Distinguished non-Catholic educators have long been urging the advisability of pupils beginning the study of the languages at an early age, and in many public schools they are now taught in the seventh and eighth grades. It would be easy to introduce a class of Latin into the seventh grade of every large parish school, for there are always pupils in such a school who would be willing to study Latin. In this way, the time now required for the completion of high school and college work might be cut down by two full years.¹

¹ For a discussion of the curriculum in American seminaries as compared with that in Italian seminaries, cf. the paper by Rev. H. J. Heuser, in *Ann. Report Cath. Ed. Assn.*, X, p. 455.

NEW STUDIES

There is a tendency, in the larger and more progressive seminaries, to shift certain studies back to the two years of philosophy, whenever this can be done without prejudice to the theological curriculum. For instance, a preliminary outline study of Sacred Scripture is now made in some institutions before theology is begun, with the view of rendering the course of Scripture in the department of theology more advanced and thorough. The same is true of Church history, as well as Hebrew and Biblical Greek. In some seminaries, the study of English is continued in the department of philosophy.¹

This policy prevents the theological curriculum from becoming overcrowded, and, at the same time, makes room in it for new studies that may be needed in the seminary. Among these may be mentioned pedagogy, and social and political science. It is clear that every priest who stands

¹ Cf. Very Rev. P. R. Heffron, *The Four Years' Course in Theology*, in *Ann. Report Cath. Ed. Assn. for 1906*, p. 211 seq.; also, Rev. F. P. Siegfried, *The Department of Philosophy in the Seminary*, in *ibid.*, X, p. 481 seq.; Very Rev. E. R. Dyer, S.S., *The Intellectual Requirements for Entrance into the Seminary*, in *ib.*, VI, p. 449; and papers by Rev. J. C. Herrick and Rev. G. V. Leahy, on *Science in the Seminary*, *ib.*, VI, p. 455 seq.

at the head of a parish school ought to know something of the science and the art of teaching.¹ It is equally clear that the pastor who labors in the city needs to have some knowledge of social and political science—a knowledge “which will be sufficiently extensive to make him acquainted with the vital facts of current social and economic conditions, tendencies and doctrines; which will be sufficiently stimulating to give him a lasting interest in these phenomena; and which will be sufficiently thorough to enable him to deal intelligently, justly, and charitably with the practical situations that he will be compelled to face.”² In the larger seminaries, it would not be difficult to arrange for a course of weekly lectures on pedagogy, as well as a course of lectures on social and political science, by competent professional men from outside. In several seminaries, something has already been done in this way. Such lectures, if followed up, in the class of moral or pastoral theology, by a further study and application of

¹ Cf. Rev. E. P. Duffy, *The Teaching of Pedagogy in the Seminary*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, II, p. 238; also papers by Very Rev. E. A. Pace, Rev. F. J. Von Antwerp and Rev. F. V. Corcoran, C.M., on *The Seminary and the Educational Problem*, in *ibid.*, VIII, p. 470 seq.; Cf. also *Resolutions of Seminary Dept.* in *ib.*, p. 468.

² Rev. John A. Ryan, *The Study of Social Problems in the Seminary*, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, V., p. 450.

the principles set forth, should add scarcely anything to the burden of regular seminary work, while they would be of direct value for the future work of the priest, and would probably lead to much fuller knowledge of these subjects later on.

In every diocese there should be at least one priest who can write Latin fluently and correctly, if not elegantly. There is necessary correspondence between the diocesan chanceries and Rome; and much of this, being of an official character, has to be in the official language of the Church. The courses of Latin in our colleges and preparatory seminaries do not afford this facility in Latin writing, even in the case of the more clever students; hence the need for some supplementary training in Latin during the years of philosophy or theology. It has been suggested that this need could best be met by having a special class in the seminary for a year or two—to be attended by select students—for advanced study of Latin style and for practice in Latin composition.

SEMINARY AND COLLEGE

A very important question has arisen with regard to the relations of the seminary and the college. It might be thought that their work would be so coordinated that the college student who desires to be a priest would be able to pass into the sem-

inary after getting the degree of A. B., and begin the study of theology at once. This is not, however, the case. The college graduate, after studying philosophy for two years or two years and a half in the college, is obliged to spend at least one year more in the philosophical department of the seminary, before being admitted to theology. A year is thus lost by the candidate for the sacred ministry who makes his collegiate studies in a regular college, rather than in a preparatory seminary and the philosophical department of a major seminary. This condition constitutes a serious disadvantage to the college, all the more so because many believe that the four-year college course itself is too long, and unduly retards the entrance of the young man upon his professional career, whether it be that of lawyer, physician or clergyman.

The effect of this condition will be, to keep many prospective clerical students from attending the college, and to cause others to leave it after the Sophomore Year and enter the philosophical department of the seminary. But would this be a bad thing? Might it not be better, for both college and seminary, if this were generally done? College men do not think so. They are anxious to enroll as many candidates for the seminary as possible, not only because such young men make excellent students, but also because their influence and

example tend to elevate the moral and religious life of the entire student body. The diversion of such students to other institutions would, therefore, involve a serious loss to the colleges. Moreover, there are some young men who remain more or less in doubt about their vocation until towards the end of the college course; and there are some who do not appear to be able to make up their minds definitely about the matter until after they have graduated and left the college. It is likely that the colleges will always contain a certain number of future seminarians, whatever may be the requirements of the seminary.

On the other hand, there are strong reasons for the attitude that has been assumed by the seminaries. The college courses in philosophy, being intended mainly for students who are to be laymen, are not usually as comprehensive and thorough as the courses in philosophy in the seminary. Furthermore, there are certain pre-theological studies given in the seminary which the college student misses entirely, notably, Scripture and Church history. Finally, there is the spiritual training necessary for the seminarian, and for this, it is maintained, the four years of theological studies are not sufficient. Many seminary authorities hold that, even apart from the question of studies, the necessity of this thorough spiritual training would alone

constitute sufficient reason for requiring college graduates to spend at least one year more in the seminary, before they begin the study of theology.¹

In the executive and advisory boards of the Catholic Educational Association, this lack of coordination between the work of the seminary and the work of the college has been frequently discussed. A representative committee, which had been appointed to consider the problem, met during the annual convention of the Association at St. Paul, in the summer of 1915, but was unable to agree upon any plan that would eliminate the difficulties involved. After the discussions of this joint committee, the Seminary Department unanimously adopted a resolution to the effect that college graduates should not be admitted to first-year theology without their making at least one year more of philosophy in the seminary, even though they had already made two years of phil-

¹ Cf. the discussion of this question at the meeting of the Cath. Ed. Assn. at St. Paul in 1915, in *Ann. Rep. C. E. A.*, including papers by Rev. J. P. O'Mahoney, C.S.V. and Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. B. Peterson, on *Relations between Cath. Seminaries and Cath. Colleges*, from the respective standpoints of the college and the seminary; also, papers by Rev. Bernard Feeney, *Where Clerics are to Study Philosophy*, and Rev. F. V. Corcoran, C.M., *The Need of a peculiarly Ecclesiastical Intellectual Training covering a Longer Period than the Course of Theology in the Seminary*.

osophy in the college.¹ From this it is evident that further progress in the settlement of the question will depend upon the colleges. The position of the seminaries is fixed, and their contention appears to be, in substance at least, entirely reasonable. To meet their legitimate demands, the colleges must provide special courses in philosophy and certain other studies, and a special system of discipline and spiritual training, for those students who are looking forward to the priesthood.

It is unnecessary to consider in detail how these changes might best be made; but they are evidently not impossible. Why, for instance, should not young men who have a vocation to the priesthood be placed together in a separate hall, under seminary rules? This is done at some European universities. Why should not the college or university offer for their special benefit—without excluding other students—courses in scholastic philosophy and Hebrew, and outline courses in Church history and Scripture? These courses would strengthen the college curricula. The courses in scholastic philosophy, if given in Latin, would render it unnecessary for these students to

¹ Cf. Summary of joint discussion, and Resolutions of Seminary Dept., at St. Paul, in *Ann. Rep. Cath. Ed. Assn.*, 1915, p. 518 seq.

continue the Latin classics, and they would thereby gain more time for philosophy. With such provisions for the special care of prospective clerical students, the colleges could probably arrange to have them admitted at once, after graduation, into the theological department of the seminaries. And such provisions would be very likely to attract prospective clerics in larger number to the colleges.

EQUIPMENT AND SUPPORT

The improvement of buildings and equipment, which has been so important a feature of the progress of Catholic education during the past two decades, has been especially marked in the case of the seminaries. The new Kenrick Seminary at St. Louis, and the archdiocesan seminaries of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Paul and San Francisco are worthy of particular mention in this connection, as are also the new religious establishments that are so impressively grouped about the Catholic University at Washington. In many other instances, where there has not been a complete reconstruction of the seminary plant, notable changes have been effected, including the erection of new buildings or the extension of old ones, improved sanitary and cuisine arrangements, and additions to the library and its equipment. Similar reconstructions or improvements have been

made at the preparatory seminaries. The conveniences and comparative comforts enjoyed by the seminarian to-day, contrasted with his condition a generation or two ago, when there was an almost complete absence of anything ministering to comfort, have raised a question, especially in the minds of some of the older clergy, as to whether the tendency towards material improvement is not being carried too far. Their fear is that the newly ordained priest, coming out from these fine modern establishments, may not have had sufficient opportunity for the practice of self-sacrifice and mortification, so essential to true priestly life and work. There is, undoubtedly, a real danger here; but, on the whole, it is plain that the improvement of the seminaries on the material side represents genuine—one might add, necessary—progress, and that the danger apprehended may be effectively met by means that are always readily at hand.

With the exception of St. Paul Seminary, which was endowed by Mr. and Mrs. James J. Hill, the seminaries are dependent upon the diocesan collections for their support. Here and there burses have been established, and special funds secured; but, in general, the expenses are defrayed from the yearly offerings of the faithful. Students from other dioceses who attend a diocesan seminary are supported by their respective bishops. The charge

COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND ITALIAN SCHOOLS¹

AMERICAN SCHOOLS.					ITALIAN SCHOOLS. ²				
GRAMMAR SCHOOL.	Latin hrs. ^a	Greek hrs.	Philos. hrs.	Other Studies.	GYMNASIUM.	Latin hrs.	Greek hrs.	Philos. hrs.	Other Studies.
12th year.....	Grammar school studies	12th year ⁴	7	Amer. gram. school studies (French optional)
13th year.....		13th year.....	7	
14th year.....		14th year.....	7	
HIGH SCHOOL:					15th year.....	6	3	Amer. gram. and high school studies
15th year.....	5	5	High school studies	16th year.....	5	3	
16th year.....	5	5		LYCEEUM:				
17th year.....	5	5		17th year.....	3	2	6½	Amer. high school and college studies
18th year.....	5	5		18th year.....	3	2	6½	
19th year.....	5	5		19th year.....	3	2	7	
COLLEGE:					SEMINARY (Univ.):				Theological studies
20th year.....	5	5	Collegiate studies ^e	20th year.....	
21st year.....	5	5	4		21st year.....	
22d year.....	4	4	4		22d year.....	
23d year.....	4	4	4		23d year ⁶	
SEMINARY: (Univ.):									
23d year.....	Theological studies					
24th year.....						
25th year.....						
26th year.....						
	38	33	12			41	12	20	

1. In this comparison, I am following the program of the Italian government schools up to the end of the gymnasium; and from thence on, the program of the Roman Seminary in its philosophical (lyceum) and theological departments respectively. On the American side, I have taken as typical the high school and classical collegiate departments of the University of Notre Dame. The Italian government program was not followed beyond the gymnasium, as those who intend to enter the sacred ministry usually go to a seminary for their lyceum work.

2. The Italian child, like the American, enters the primary school at the age of six or seven. Those who intend to enter secondary schools generally take a special examination called *maturita* at the end of the fifth year of the primary school, and, if successful in this, they pass into the *ginnasio*.

3. Class hours per week.

4. Year of age.

5. At the University of Notre Dame the collegiate classical studies, besides Latin, Greek and philosophy, are English, history (Greek and Roman), and rhetoric; the corresponding studies in the vernacular language and history are taken by the Italian student during his lyceum course, though I am unable to say whether these studies are carried as far in the Italian lyceum as they are in the American college.

6. The Italian seminary has to spend at least one year in military service. He would thus be, ordinarily, at least twenty-four years of age when he finishes theology.

for such seminarians varies somewhat throughout the country, but is usually about \$200 per annum. It need scarcely be said that this is barely sufficient to cover the actual cost of the student's maintenance. In some seminaries it is not sufficient, and the balance has to be gotten from other sources. Religious seminaries are, of course, supported by the respective religious orders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Parish Schools of the Diocese of Albany.* 1913-1916.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Parish Schools of the Diocese of Newark.* 1910-1916.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Parish Schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.* 1895-1916.
- BURNS, REV. JAMES A., Ph.D. *The Principles, Origin, and Establishment of the Catholic School System in the United States.* New York: Benziger Bros., 1908, pp. 416.
- BURNS, REV. JAMES A., Ph.D. *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States.* New York: Benziger Bros., 1912, pp. 421.
- Catholic Citizens and Public Education.* New York: Catholic Book Exchange, 1902, pp. 32.
- Catholic Directory.* Annual. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.
- Catholic Educational Association, Annual Reports of.* 1904-1916.
- Catholic Educational Association, Quarterly Bulletins of.* 1904-1916.
- COLER, BIRD S. *Socialism in the Schools.* New York: The Eastern Press, 1911, pp. 22.
- COLER, BIRD S. *The Residuary Sect.* New York: The Eastern Press, 1911, pp. 19.
- Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C., Annual Reports.*

- HOWARD, REV. FRANCIS W., D.D. *The Catholic Position in Education*, pp. 12.
An address delivered before the Protestant Ministers of Columbus, O., Feb. 7, 1910.
- PACE, VERY REV. EDWARD A., Ph.D. *The Influence of Religious Education on the Motives of Conduct*. Reprinted from *Proceedings of the N. E. A.*, 1903, pp. 346-350.
- PACE, VERY REV. EDWARD A., Ph.D. *Modern Psychology and Catholic Education*. Reprinted from *Cath. World*, Sept., 1905, in *Educational Briefs*, Phila., 1905, pp. 22.
- SHIELDS, REV. THOMAS EDWARD, Ph.D. *The Education of Our Girls*. New York: Benziger Bros., 1907, pp. 299.
- SHIELDS, REV. THOMAS EDWARD, Ph.D. *Philosophy of Education*. Washington: The Catholic Education Press, 1917, pp. 446.
- STUART, JANET ERSKINE. *The Education of Catholic Girls*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911, pp. 243.
- TIERNEY, REV. RICHARD H., S. J. *Teacher and Teaching*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915, pp. 178.
- Year Book of the Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of St. Louis*. 1911, 1912.

INDEX

- Academic standards in Catholic education, 7, 8.
Administrative work in college, 166, 167.
Age of high school pupil, 105.
American and Italian schools compared, 177-181, 191
Ascetical exercises in seminaries, 174.
Assessments for maintenance of high schools, 100.
Athletics in Catholic colleges, 152.
Austerity in college life, 149, 150.
- Belgians, Catholic education for, 1.
Benedictine colleges, 147.
Bible reading in public schools, 15, 16.
Biblical Greek, study of, 182.
Bibliography, 193-194.
Bishops, influence of the, 62, 63.
Bohemians, Catholic education for, 1.
Boys, high schools for, 58, 88, 89.
 classification of high school, 108, 109.
 teaching Brothers for, 88, 89.
Business, women in, 119.
- Cahill, Thomas E., 58.
Carnegie Foundation, report of, 102.
Cathedral colleges, 170, 171.
Catholic College Conference, 58, 130.
Catholic education, academic standards in, 7, 8.
 for foreigners, 1.
 qualifications of, 6-12.

- Catholic education, religious influence in, 6, 21-29, 36-39, 45-47,
155-166, 174.
statistics of, 2-6, 127, 130, 131, 172, 191.
teaching standards in, 10-12, 43, 44, 68-75.
unity in, 60-65.
- Catholic Educational Association, admittance of college women
to, 133.
college investigation of, 126, 139, 187.
high school reforms of, 52, 124.
school time reforms of, 79, 80, 107, 108.
work of, 59, 60, 61.
- Catholic educational problems, discussion of, 59.
- Catholic ethics, simplicity of, 27, 28.
- Catholic Girls' High School, 113, 114.
- Catholic professors, service of, 142, 143, 162-164.
- Catholic pupils in non-Catholic institutions, 3, 4, 75, 91, 92,
112, 114, 130-132.
- Catholic textbooks, 38.
- Catholic University, growth of, 136.
maintenance of, 142, 143, 146.
scholarships to, 134.
seminaries of, 189.
summer school at, 11, 12.
- Cavanaugh, Rev. John W., C.S.C., 47 (note).
- Central high schools, 58, 93, 94, 96.
cost of, 99-101.
- Changes in Catholic college life, 149-155.
- Character formation in Catholic schools, 43-47.
- Christian Brothers' colleges, 147.
schools of, 101.
- Christian symbols in school, 42, 43.
- Christian teaching in schools, 18, 19, 21-25, 28, 29.
- Church history study in seminaries, 182.
- Classes, size of, 73, 74.
- Classical college courses, 117, 171.
- Classification of colleges, 141.

- Classification of boys' schools, 108, 109.
 - of girls' schools, 115.
 - of seminaries, 169, 170.
- College relations with seminary, 184-189.
- College scholarships, 93, 134, 146.
- Colleges, classification of, 141.
 - curriculum in, 138-141.
 - discipline in, 149-155.
 - dormitories for, 150-152.
 - endowments for, 142-144, 146.
 - enrollment in, 3, 5, 123, 124, 126-132.
 - entrance requirements for, 89, 90, 139, 140.
 - for women, 119, 120, 123, 124, 132, 133.
 - intellectual growth in, 166-168.
 - moral training in, 154, 155.
 - organization of, 48-50.
 - preparation of pupils for, 49, 51, 52, 89-93, 123, 124, 136-138.
 - religious influence in, 43-47, 155-161.
 - religious orders in, 43, 48, 49, 142, 147.
 - seminary courses in, 188, 189.
 - statistics of, 3, 127, 130, 131.
 - teaching standards in, 43, 147, 162-168.
 - total abstinence in, 160, 161.
 - vocations in, 158-160.
- Community inspector of schools, 67.
- Community training courses, 11, 70-73.
- Commercial study for girls, 115, 121.
- Compulsory education laws, 85.
- Correlation of studies, 34, 35, 78.
- Cost of Catholic colleges, 142-147.
 - of high schools, 97-101.
 - of parish schools, 12.
 - of professional schools, 135.
- Council of Trent, decrees of, 169, 171.
- Creeds, teaching of, 15.
- Creighton University, endowment of, 146.

- Crucifix in school, 42, 43, 45.
Cultural studies for girls, 115-117.
Curriculum, content of, 76-78.
 correlation of studies in, 32-41, 78.
 in boys' schools, 101-104.
 in girls' schools, 115-117, 121-125.
 length of, 78-80, 104-110.
 of preparatory seminary, 171.
 of seminary, 174-184.
 reformation of, 104-110.
 religious teaching in, 36, 37.
 standardization of college, 138-141.
 time problem in, 78-87.
- Diocesan high schools, 58.
Diocesan school board, 67, 69, 70, 71.
Diocesan school system, 57, 66-68.
Diocesan seminaries, 170.
Discipline in colleges, 149-155.
 in seminaries, 173, 174.
Domestic science in high schools, 121, 122.
Dormitories for colleges, 150-152.
Dwenger, Bishop Joseph, 57.
Dyer, Rev. E. R., S.S., 175 (note), 182 (note).
- Elective courses, 138, 139, 145.
Elementary schools, relation of high schools to, 48-54, 93-97.
 statistics of, 2.
Endowments of Catholic institutions, 141-144, 146, 190.
Engineering students in college, 127, 128.
English in high schools, 104.
 in seminaries, 182.
Enrollment in colleges, 3, 5, 127-133.
 in elementary schools, 2, 3, 83, 84.
 in secondary schools, 2, 3, 4, 111.
Enrollment statistics, 2-6, 83, 84, 111, 127, 130, 131, 132.

- Entrance requirements for colleges, 89, 90, 139, 140.
for seminaries, 174-176, 185-189.
- Equipment in Catholic schools, 7.
of seminaries, 189-192.
- Ethical system, simplicity of Catholic, 27, 28.
- Examination of teachers, 69, 70, 71.
- Federal Bureau of Education, report of, 107.
- Foreigners, Catholic education for, 1.
- Formal studies, 76, 77.
- Fourth Provincial Council of Cincinnati, 57.
- Free high schools, 113, 114.
- French, Catholic education for, 1.
- Future life, instruction as to, 22, 23.
- Germans, Catholic education for, 1.
- Girls, diocesan schools for, 58.
high schools for, 111-115.
life work of, preparation for, 120, 124, 125.
- Government of seminaries, 173.
- Greek in high schools, 90, 104.
in seminaries, 178.
- Greeks, Catholic education for, 1.
- Habits, formation of, 17.
- Hebrew, study of, in seminaries, 182.
- Herbart, 35, 37.
- High schools, assessments for, 100.
cost of, 97-101.
curriculum in, 101-104, 115-117, 120-125.
preparation for college in, 49, 51, 52, 89-93, 123, 124.
relations of, with parish schools, 51-54, 93-97.
religious orders in, 48, 52, 58, 88, 89, 94, 95, 115.
specialization in, 121-125.
statistics of, 2, 3, 5.
teachers in, 52, 58, 88, 89, 115.

High Schools, time problem in, 104-110.

Hill, James J., 190.

History in high schools, 104.

Holy Cross College, gift to, 63.

Howard, Rev. Francis W., 81 (note).

Hughes, Bishop, 15, 16.

Hungarians, Catholic education for, 1.

Indians, Catholic education for, 1.

Intellectual growth of teachers, 166-168.

Ireland, Archbishop, 18.

Italian and American schools compared, 177-181, 191.

Italians, Catholic education for, 1.

James, William, 34.

Jesuit colleges, 147.

Jesuit seminary, 170.

Junior colleges, 137, 138, 141.

Junior and senior high schools, 106, 107, 109, 110.

Kenrick seminary, 189.

Knights of Columbus scholarships, 134.

Languages in high schools, 104.

in parish schools, 181.

Latin composition, study of, 184.

Latin in high schools, 89, 90, 104.

in parish schools, 181.

in seminaries, 177, 178, 180, 181.

Law schools, 135.

Lecture courses for Catholic educators, 61, 183.

Life work, preparation of girls for, 120, 124, 125.

Lithuanians, Catholic education for, 1.

Luxury in college life, 152, 153.

McDevitt, Rt. Rev. Philip R., 14 (note), 58 (note), 68 (note)
80, 87 (note), 97 (note).

- Maintenance of colleges, 142-147.
 of high schools, 97-101, 113.
 of parish schools, 12-14, 56.
 of professional schools, 135.
 of seminaries, 189-192
- Manual training schools, 101.
- Marquette University, endowment of, 146.
- Mathematics in high schools, 104.
- Medical schools, 135.
- Milwaukee Convention, 59.
- Missionary societies in colleges, 159, 160.
- Missionary vocations in college, 158, 159.
- Montessori, Maria, theory of, 31.
- Moral training in colleges, 154, 155.
 in Catholic schools, 17, 21-28.
 in public schools, 16-19, 28, 29.
- Morality and religion, unity of, 24, 25, 27-29.
- Neumann, Bishop John Nepomucene, 57.
- Non-Catholic colleges, Catholic enrollment in, 91, 92, 130-132.
- Normal training for Catholic schools, 11, 12, 69-73, 129.
- Notre Dame, University, dormitory for, 150, 151.
- Nuns as teachers, 58, 88, 89.
- Overcrowding in parish schools, 73, 74.
- Pace, Rev. Edward A., 40 (note), 183 (note).
- Parish assessments for high schools, 100.
- Parish high schools, 97, 98.
- Parish schools, curriculum in, 75-83.
 establishment of, 48.
 Latin in, 181.
 maintenance of, 12-14, 56.
 overcrowding in, 73, 74.
 relation of, to college, 60, 61.
 to high schools, 48-54, 93-97.

- Parish schools, religious orders in, 10-12, 74, 75.
 teachers in, 68-75.
- Pastor, influence of the, 60-62, 67.
- Paternalism in public schools, 31, 32.
- Pedagogy, study of, 61, 182, 183.
- Philosophy, study of, in seminaries, 178, 179, 181, 185-189.
- Pius X., Pope, decrees of, 169.
- Poles, Catholic education for, 1.
- Political science, study of, 182, 183.
- Post-graduate courses in colleges, 134.
- Prefect of religion in college, 157, 158.
- Preparatory seminaries, 170-173.
- Preparatory students in college, 127, 136, 137.
- Priesthood, vocations to, 159, 172.
- Pritchett, Dr. Henry S., 102.
- Private rooms in Catholic colleges, 150-152.
- Professional courses in colleges, 128, 135.
- Professional students in college, 127.
- Professions, women in the, 119.
- Professors in Catholic colleges, 142, 143.
- Propagation of the Faith, Society of, 159, 160.
- Propedeutics, study of, 177, 178, 179.
- Protestant influence in public schools, 15, 16.
- Protestant religious instruction, 19-20.
- Public high schools, curriculum of, 102, 103.
- Public schools, Catholic pupils in, 3, 4, 75, 112, 114.
 moral training in, 16-19, 28, 29.
 religious instruction in, 15, 16, 29.
 teaching standards in, 9, 10.
- Pupils, influence of the, 44, 45.
- Reading list, 193, 194.
- Religion and morality, unity of, 24, 25, 27-29.
- Religious communities in Catholic education, 1, 11, 58, 62, 70-73,
 88, 142, 169, 170.
- Religious community in high schools, 94, 95.

- Religious influence in Catholic education, 6, 21, 22, 36-38, 45-47, 155-161, 174.
- Religious instruction in public schools, 15, 29.
omission of, from studies, 40, 41.
- Religious orders in colleges, 43, 49, 142, 147.
in seminaries, 172, 173, 192.
- Religious seminaries, 170.
spirit in, 173, 174.
- St. Mary's Seminary, 170.
- St. Paul's Seminary, 190.
- Sage Foundation, investigation by, 83.
- Salaries of college professors, 145, 146.
of high school teachers, 98, 99.
- Scholarship in college life, 167, 168.
- Scholarships in Catholic colleges, 93, 134, 146.
- School attendance, problem of, 83-87.
- Schumacher, Rev. Matthew A., C.S.C., 141 (note).
- Science in high schools, 104.
- Scriptural studies in seminaries, 182.
- Secondary schools, see *High Schools*.
- Sectional high schools, 96.
- Secular seminaries, 170.
- Seminaries, classification of, 169, 170.
curriculum in, length of, 175-181.
equipment of, 189-192.
government and discipline of, 173, 174.
maintenance of, 189-192.
new studies in, 182-184.
relation of, to colleges, 184-189.
statistics of, 172.
- Seminary rules in colleges, 188, 189.
- Senior high schools, 106-110.
- Sex instruction, 25, 26, 31.
- Shahan, Rt. Rev. Thomas J., 24.
- Shields, Rev. Thomas E., 34 (note), 38 (note).

- Six and six high school plan, 106.
Slovak Sisterhood, 1.
Slovaks, Catholic education for, 1.
Social science, study of, 182, 183.
Sorin Hall, 150, 151.
Spaniards, Catholic education for, 1.
Specialization in girls' education, 121-125.
Statistics of Catholic institutions, 2-6, 127, 130, 131, 172, 191.
Studies, correlation of, 32, 33, 78.
 in high schools, 101-104, 120-125.
 in parish schools, 75-78.
 in seminaries, 174-189.
Sulpicians' seminary, 170.
Summer courses for Catholic teachers, 11, 12, 129.
Sunday schools, 20, 21, 39.
- Teachers, duties of college, 166, 167.
 examination of, 70, 71.
 influence of, 42-44, 147, 148, 162-165, 167, 168.
 in colleges, 43, 147, 162-168.
 in high schools, 88, 89, 115.
 in parish schools, 68-75.
 intellectual growth of, 166-168.
 preparation of, 11, 69-72, 129, 162, 163.
 salaries of high school, 98, 99.
 statistics of, 2.
 university training for, 11, 12, 129, 165, 166.
 women as, 8, 9, 88, 89, 118.
- Teaching Brothers for boys, 89.
Teaching communities, 1, 11, 58, 62, 70-73, 88.
Teaching staff, 104.
Teaching standards in Catholic schools, 10-12, 43, 44, 68, 69.
 in college, 43, 147, 162-168.
 in public schools, 9, 10.
Theology in colleges, 135.
 in seminaries, 177.

- Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 56, 57, 66, 69, 70, 71, 174, 175.
- Time problem in Catholic schools, 78-87.
in seminary curriculum, 176-181.
- Total abstinence in colleges, 160, 161.
- Trinity College, 132, 136.
- Tuition fees in college, 144.
in girls' high schools, 113.
- Unity in Catholic education, 60-65.
of morality and religion, 24, 25, 27-29.
- University, development of, 133-135.
maintenance of, 142-147.
teaching in, 147, 148.
- University training for teachers, 11, 12, 129, 165, 166.
- Vocations in college, 158.
in seminaries, 172.
to teaching communities, 62, 75, 89.
- Waldron, Brother John, 68 (note), 70 (note), 79 (note), 82 (note).
- Women as teachers, 8, 9, 88, 89, 118.
colleges for, 119, 120, 123, 124, 132, 133.
in the commercial world, 119.
in the professions, 119.
- World's Sunday School Convention, 21.
- Xaverian Brothers' School, 101.

PRINTED BY BRAUNWORTH & CO., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

This book is due on the last date stamped

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0315023931

C440863

936.73
B937

